REMARKS

On a Late

DISCOURSE

OF

WILLIAM

LORD BISHOP

OF

DERRY;

CONCERNING

The Inventions of Men in the Worship of God.

4 Eph. 25.

---Speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another.

By *J. Boyse.*

Printed for *Ephraim Dobson, Matthew Gun,* and *Patrick Campbel,* Booksellers in *Dublin.* 1694.

The PREFACE.

I Am ſo averſe to all *Controverſies* in general, and particularly to thoſe *leſs momentuous ones*, that are ſtill continued between the *Eſtabliſht Church* and *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, that 'tis not without great reluctancy and regret, that I am once more engag'd in 'em by the following *Remarks*, on the late celebrated *Diſcourſe of the Biſhop of* Derry, *concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worſhip of God.* For I look on that revival of theſe Debates amongſt us, which his *Lordſhip's Diſcourſe* has given occaſion for, as very *unſeaſonable* in this *Kingdom*, and particularly at this *juncture.* We have here ſo valuable a common *Intereſt* (even a conjunction of our Religious and Civil ones) that requires all our joint endeavours to promote, that we have no need to be diverted from 'em, by awakening any dormant Conteſts about the intereſt of leſſer Opinions and Practices. And this ſeems the more improper at ſuch a *time* when there was a proſpect of a *Parliament* being call'd here, and of the ſame *Bill of Indulgence* for *Proteſtant Diſſenters* coming before 'em, that is already paſt in *England.* A *Bill* that ſeems moſt neceſſary here to encourage the Replanting this impoveriſh'd and deſolate Kingdom with Proteſtants, by providing that *Legal Security* for all of 'em, that wou'd beget a mutual confidence in each other, facilitate a nearer Union of our Affections, and bind us all in more inviolable duty to their Majeſties; under whoſe Indulgent Government we ſhou'd all enjoy both Protection and Favour. Whereas the renewing theſe Diſputes has too probable a tendency to put the Spirits of Men into a new *ferment*, in which they will be leſs diſpos'd for ſo calm and peaceable, ſo charitable and healing Counſells. For 'tis rare to find theſe publick Debates ſo manag'd, as not to *widen* Differences rather then *compoſe* 'em and *heighten* rather than *allay* the animoſities of the contending Parties.

Bue

But yet I humbly conceive that his Lordſhip has by this *Diſcourſe* lay'd the *Diſſenters* under an unavoydable neceſſity of reſuming theſe Debates, ſo far as they are handled therein: And accordingly there are two *Reaſons*, that I ſhall offer for the publication of theſe *Remarks*.

1. *The Proteſtant Diſſenters cou'd not omit this attempt to defend themſelves without betraying both the Intereſt of Truth, and that of their own Innocence and juſt Reputation.*

For his *Lordſhip's. Diſcourſe* having charg'd us in ſo many Inſtances *with caſting God's own Appointments out of his Worſhip*, and *with introducing ſo great a mixture of Human Inventions*, has brought us under this unhappy *Dilemma*, That either we muſt ſeem to *Own* the Truth and Juſtice of ſo heavy a charge by our *Silence*: or if we think our ſelves greatly wrong'd muſt appear, tho unwillingly, and unſeaſonably, in our own *Vindication*. For as the *Biſhop*, by his *former Attempt*, (without any occaſion given him) to diſſeize us of our Spiritual Birthright, (I mean to *exclude us from the Catholick Church*) oblig'd us to aſſert our juſt claim to that invaluable *priviledge*; So by this *New Eſſay* to repreſent our Worſhip as ſo miſerably *corrupted with Human Inventions*, and *diſagreable to the Directions of Scripture* he has lay'd us under the ſame obligation, to aſſert it's *purity* and *Conformity* to that ſacred *Rule*, ſo far as we think it unjuſtly accus'd of deviating from it. So that I hope our moderate Conforming Brethren (towards whom we bear the moſt charitable diſpoſition) will by no means be offended with us, for our modeſt endeavours, to clear our ſelves from ſo invidious a charge, or to retort it on our Accuſer, where his Arguments are more cogent againſt the practices he undertakes to *defend*, then thoſe he *oppoſes*. Nay we think the *Biſhop* himſelf cannot blame us for this, who has ſo frequently urg'd us to examine what he has alledg'd againſt us; demanded our proof of ſuch Principles as he imputes to us; and hereby ſignifi'd that he expects from us the *Reſult* of our ſerious thoughts on what he has offer'd to our View. So that we cannot refuſe to oblige him herein,

without

without failing of the *reſpect* we owe to his *Lordſhip* as well as the *Juſtice* we owe to *Truth* and to our *Selves*. And even *Charity* it ſelf ſeems to prompt us to it; For as we wou'd be glad to reconcile his *Lordſhip*, and all that applaud his Book, to a more favourable opinion of our *Worſhip*, then is therein ſuggeſted, ſo we are neceſſitated in order thereto, to ſhew him thoſe *miſtakes* on which his *prejudices* againſt it are founded.

2. *The Biſhops manner of treating this Subject ſeems too diſingenuous to paſs without ſome juſt Animadverſions upon it.*

'Tis indeed true that his Lordſhip has ſhewn great dexterity of *Wit* in treating of this Controverſy in ſo new a method and *Tour*, as to put the *Diſſenters* on the neceſſity of *defending* themſelves from the force of an Argument, in which they thought hitherto they had rather the advantage of being *Aſſailants*. And he has for the moſt part wrote with an Air of *ſeriouſneſs* and *gravity* becoming the *weight* of the *Subject* as well as the *dignity* of his *Character*. Nor do there want ſome *kind* expreſſions that ſeem to argue, that his former cenſoriouſneſs and rigor is allay'd, ſince in this Diſcourſe he ſo often treats us with the obliging apellation of his *Friends* and his *Brethern*. 'Tis true ſome jealous People think it doubtful, becauſe, tho he call us *Friends* in one place, he ſeems to explain it of *Back-Friends*, *p.* 169. in another and tho he often ſtyle us his *Brethren* that may be only in the ſame ſenſe as *Heathens* and *Publicans* are, ſince he ſtill ſpeaks of us as *fallen off from the Church*, and disbelieving the Report of the Goſpel, *p.* 166. But I am willing rather to meaſure his Inclinations by thoſe kind and charitable Words that ſeem to drop from his Pen, when his Thoughts are *cool*, then by thoſe harſher ones that the *heat* of Diſpute may ſuggeſt. Only his *Brethren* wou'd have been greatly ſatisfied, to have found ſome more explicit declaration of his *Charity* by his owning us to be a part of the *Catholick Church*, and think he wou'd have beſt conſulted his own reputation by repairing the wrong done to ſo many excellent Churches in caſting 'em ſo peremptorely out of it.

But there are these following Instances of so great *disingenuity* in his *Discourse*, as deserve some just Reflections on 'em. As

1. He has in every part of it run into many *mistakes* about *matter of Fact*, and some of 'em so *gross*, that a very ordinary care and diligence in his Enquiries might have prevented. Nor needed he have gone farther to have rectify'd many of those mistakes then (not only the Dioceſs, but) the City where he now resides. And yet in some of those *mistakes* he speaks with so great a height of *assurance* as is enough to possess all those Readers with the belief of the truth of what he delivers, who take these matters on the credit of his testimony and relation. But 'tis well for us, that the strongest Asseverations will not change the nature of things, nor weigh down the evidence of sense in matters of Fact. And therefore I hope that his Lordship will not misinterpret it as a failure in the deference we owe to his Character, if we call such palpable misrepresentations of our *Principles* or *Practices*, *calumnies*, and urge him either to *prove* or *retract* 'em. For sure he that unjustly *accuses* others, has no right to blame 'em for telling him that he dos so; and cannot expect that those he *accuses* should out of excess of Civility and Complement seem to countenance his groundless Accusations by a cold and faint denyal, and forbear to manifest their own Innocence for fear of exposing thereby the Reputation of their Reverend Accuser. And therefore, if the *charge* of *injustice* and *wrong* done us, in his accounts of us, that so often occurs in these *Remarks*, may seem *harsh* and *severe*, he must thank himself for it, and has no ground to complain if the *charge* it self be true.

2. He has taken occasion from such palpable *mistakes* in matters of Fact, to fasten upon us the most *invidious*, but the most *unjust Reflections*, tho guilded over with smooth and specious language (like *bitter Pills* cover'd with *Leaf Gold*) to make 'em go the more easily down. And of these so many will occur under each *Chapter* as will supersede the necessity of mentioning 'em here.

3. Where

3. Where he miſtakes our *Principles* and *Practices*, he frequently feignes a great many *Reaſons*, as alledg'd by us in defence of thoſe he groundleſsly imputes to us, and ſpends a great part of his *Book* in confutation of 'em; whereby his ignorant Readers that take theſe matters on truſt from him are tempted to imagine he is *confuting us*, when he is only *fighting with his own ſhadow*, and anſwering *Objections*, which himſelf dos not pretend to produce any *Author* for. See the Chapter of *Prayer*, from *p.* 57. to *p.* 67. See the Chapter of *Hearing*, from *p.* 86. to *p.* 101. See the Chapter of *Bodily Worſhip*, from *p.* 130. to *p.* 142.

Now I take this method of treating ſuch *Controverſies*, wherein the reputation of a great body of Proteſtants are concern'd, to be ſo highly *diſingenuous*, that as ſuch Authors deſerve a gentle Reproof, ſo 'tis neceſſary out of regard to *charity* and *peace* it ſelf to obviate the pernicious influence of ſuch *Writings*. For ſuch *Writings* tend to make *differences* between us ſeem *greater* then they are, and to *exaſperate* rather then *heal* the Wounds caus'd by 'em. Whereas a contrary, judicious, and fair ſtating of *Controverſies* tends to narrow 'em, and ſeldom fails to bring the contending parties to a nearer agreement of *Judgment* as well as *Affection*. And this I can truly profeſs to be the principal deſign of theſe *Remarks*. And tho I am conſcious of the weakneſs of my own abilities for ſuch an undertaking, yet I am not, of any inclination to ſet *Proteſtants* at a greater diſtance from one another. On the contrary, I ſhall think my time in writing theſe *Remarks* well employ'd, if they contribute any thing to reconcile ſober *Proteſtants* to more favourable and charitable thoughts of thoſe different *modes of worſhip* that yet remain among 'em, and to convince 'em how little theſe *differences* ſhou'd ſignify to *abate* our *eſteem* and *love* for ſuch who are agreed with us in thoſe far more important matters, wherein the *Kingdom of God* chiefly conſiſts. For as all that in theſe things *ſerve our common* Maſter, are herein *acceptable to God*, ſo they ſhould be (on the ſame ſcore) *approv'd* and affectionately honour'd by one another, 1 *Rom.* Ch. 14. Ver. 18. And therefore if his *Lordſhip* can ſhew me any thing in theſe Papers contrary to this *deſign*, or any ſuch miſrepreſentation of *their* Principles,

ciples and Practices, as I have here charg'd him with in reference to *ours*, I ſhall moſt readily retract it, as I humbly expect the like *candour* from himſelf.

Having truly propos'd what were my inducements to publiſh theſe *Remarks*, I ſhall only add one Obſervation neceſſary to prevent miſtakes, *viz.* That the matters treated on in this *Diſcourſe* of the *Bp's* are by no means the main hing on which the *Controverſy* between the *Eſtabliſh't Church* and the *Diſſenters* turns. So that his *Lordſhip* has only acted in this defence of the *Eſtabliſh't Church* like the *Governour* of a *Garriſon* that takes the greateſt pains to maintain the *beſt fortifi'd parts* of it, while he leaves thoſe *feeble places* unguarded, againſt which the *Strongeſt Batterys* are plac't. But none can blame his Lordſhips prudence in chooſing a *Poſt* which he thought himſelf moſt capable to *make good*. And if he not only *defend* that, but in a reſolute *ſally* ſeize ſome of the Enemys *Canon* and turn it againſt themſelves, It muſt be own'd for a conſiderable *Service*. No doubt he ſuppoſes he has done ſo; how juſtly, I ſhall leave to the Reader's unbyaſt Judgment when he has perus'd theſe *Remarks*, in which I ſhall trace his *Lordſhips* ſteps in the clear and accurate method he has lay'd down.

CON-

Contents of the ſeveral Chapters.

Remarks on the Introduction, from p. 1. *to p.* 10.

Remarks on the I *Chapter concerning* Praiſes

On the Biſhop's Account of the Directions of the holy Scripture concerning it, from p. 10 *to p.* 19.
On the Bp's Application of 'em to the practice of the Eſtabliſht Church, *and that of the* Diſſenters, *from p.* 19 *to p.* 31.

Remarks on the II *Chapter concerning* Prayer.
On the Bp's Account of the Directions of the holy Scriptures concerning it, from p. 31 *to p.* 51.
On the Application of 'em, &c. from p. 51 *to p.* 72.

Remarks on the III *Chapter concerning* Hearing.
On the Bp's Account of the Directions of the holy Scriptures concerning it, from p. 72 *to p.* 82.
On the Application of 'em, &c. from p. 82. *to p.* 104.

Remarks on the IV *Chapter concerning* Bodily Worſhip.
On the Bp's Account of the Directions of the holy Scriptures concerning it, p. 105, 106.
On the Application of 'em, &c. from p. 106 *to p.* 113.
On the Bp's Arguments for kneeling at the Receiving the Lord's-Supper, from p. 113 *to p.* 123.—*On the remainder of that Chapter, from p.* 123 *to p.* 130.

Remarks on the V *Chapter concerning the* Lord's-Supper.
On the Bp's Account of the Directions of the holy Scripture concerning the frequency of Receiving, p. 131, 132.
On the Application of 'em, &c. from p. 132 *to p.* 138.

Contents of the ſeveral Chapters.

Remarks on the Concluſion.

On the Bp's Advice to the Conforming Clergy of his Dioceſs, from p. 138. *to p.* 141.
On his Advice to the Diſſenting Miniſters of it, from p. 142 *to p.* 157.
On his Advice to the Conforming *Laity of his Dioceſs. p.* 158, 159,
On his Advice to the Diſſenting Laity of it, from p. 159 *to* 170.

APPENDIX.

1. *Concerning Baptiſm, and the uſe of the Croſs, and of God-fathers and God-mothers, from p.* 171 *to* 177.
2. *Concerning ſinful Human Inventions in the Diſcipline of the Church, p.* 177.
Requeſts to the Reverend Conforming Clergy in 13 *particulars, from p.* 177 *to* 191.
Poſtſcript, relating to the Bible---Poetry, from p. 192 *to* 198.

ERRATA.

Preface, line 2*d*. for momentanous, read momentous.

PAge 12. line 1. blot out *and*. p. 29 l. 19. for *Aventinus* and *Anoymus* read *Aventinus Annal. Boior. l.* 3. p. 300 *Edit. Ingolſt.* 1554. *& Aymon. de Geſtis Francorum, lib.* 4. and *cap.* 64. and 144. p. 55. l. 15. blot out *of*. p. 88. l. 25. for 2 *Chron.* 19. ch. 23 *v.* read 29 ch. p. 102. l. 18. for *condems*, r. *condemns*. p. 117. l. 30. read, *For his firſt Anſwer to the Argument brought for ſitting, from the example of the Apoſtles, when Chriſt adminiſtred this Sacrament, viz.* p. 137. l. 15, 16. r. Not celebrating it oftner in each, *&c.* p. 156. laſt line, r. ſpiritual. p. 165. l. 32. blot out a. p. 169. l. 15. And for the common cuſtom of many ſuch *Sponſors*, who pretend to excuſe themſelves from what they have promis't, by devolving the charge back on the Parents as ſoon as the Baptiſm is over, 'tis no better than a profane trifling with ſo ſacred a thing as a publick Religious Vow and Promiſe. *The Book is wrong pag'd, from* 168 *to the end.*

Re-

Remarks upon the Introduction.

UPon the Review of the Introduction, and comparing it with the following Chapters, I was greatly surpriz'd to find these 3 unusual and palpable defects in it, than which, I scarce know 3 more inexcusable ones a Writer can be guilty of, that pretends to treat a controversial subject, *Viz.*

1. Tho he stiles his Book, *A Discourse concerning the Inventions of men in the Worship of God*, Yet he has not in all those 188 pages, of which it consists, so much as once stated the true notion of 'em, or told us what he means by 'em. A strange oversight in one that pretends to have so *carefully examin'd* this matter, and has said so many things relating to it, which he cou'd not but foresee wou'd fall under the critical examination of those on whose principles and practices he has made so many and severe Reflections; especially when he cou'd not well be ignorant that the subject he undertakes to discourse on is very *ambiguous*, and capable of being taken in so different senses. But 'tis easy to ghess what kind of *superstructure* he is like to raise, when he has forgot to lay the *foundation*. So that we are oblig'd to desire his Lordship to write another Discourse to state the Question; that we may know what the Arguments in this are levelled for, or against.

2. But there is a worse fault this Discourse is chargeable with, *viz.* That as far as his Lp's meaning can be gather'd from his words, he has given us 2 inconsistent Notions of *human Inventions* in the Worship of God, which yet he has taken no care to distinguish, and tell us fairly when he intends the one, and when the other.

Sometimes by the *Inventions of men* in the Worſhip of God, he ſeems to underſtand ſome things relating either to the *matter*, or the *manner* of Religious Worſhip, that are unlawful and ſinful: Thus in his firſt Paragraph, *Our bleſſed Saviour* (ſaith he) *has taught us that there are ſome ways of worſhipping God which have ſo great a mixture of human Invention in 'em, that they are vain and unacceptable to him*, for which he quotes 7 *Mark* 7. A paſſage which (as I ſhall ſhew anon) plainly refers to thoſe Jewiſh Traditions which our Saviour there arraigns as guilty of ſinful Superſtition. And again in his principles, *p.* 3. he ſeems to lay down his Notion of the Inventions of men in the worſhip of God, when he there tells us, *That ſince God has given us a certain direction for his Worſhip in the H. Scriptures, It is to be ſuppos'd that all ways of Worſhip are diſpleaſing to him, that are not expreſly contain'd, or warranted by Examples of H. men mention'd therein.* 'Tis true indeed, that if he intend this for a deſcription of ſuch *human Inventions*, we are not much the wiſer for it, (as I ſhall obſerve afterwards). But this we may certainly inferr from it, that he underſtands by 'em ſuch *ways of Worſhip* as are *diſpleaſing to God*, becauſe deſtitute of ſcriptural *Precept* and *Pattern*. Now I wou'd intreat his Lordſhip to acquaint us how we ſhall reconcile this with his owning ſuch things to be *lawful*, to which this very notion of *human Inventions* do's agree, and which he calls by that very name. To give him an Inſtance in his firſt Chapter about *Praiſe*. He there charges the Diſſenters way of praiſing God by *ſinging Pſalms in metre* as deſtitute of all *Command* or *Precedent* from the Scripture, and as a *purely human Invention*, *p.* 24. And yet in the very beginning of that Section that concerns the Diſſenters manner of Praiſing God, *he deſires us to obſerve, for preventing miſtakes, that he do's not condemn the ſinging Pſalms in Metre as unlawful.* And no wonder, when he foreſaw that he muſt otherwiſe have condemn'd what is practis'd in the Pariſh-Churches; For tho he tells us this is but a voluntary entertainment of devotion in their publick Aſſemblies, yet there were all poſſible reaſon to caſt it out, if it were a ſinful way of praiſing God according to the firſt Notion of *human*

man Inventions. 'Tis evident then that he ſometimes underſtands by *human Inventions* ſome ſinful ways of Worſhip, ſometimes ſuch innocent modes of it as are of human determination. Nay, ſo *jumbled* are his notions of this matter, that tho he own *Sermons* to have the warrant of ſcriptural *Example*, yet he ranks 'em among the *Inventions of men*, p. 102. And this uncertain ſenſe of this ſlippery phraſe breeds ſo miſerable a confuſion in his whole diſcourſe, that when he tells us ſo often of our *human Inventions*, we are at a loſs whether he ſpeak it by way of *applauſe* or *cenſure*, whether he *commend our uſe of Chriſtian prudence*, or *arraign us as guilty of ſuperſtition*. But

3. I have a ſeverer Reflection yet to add, *viz.* That his Lp. has made this ſtrange confuſion in his own Notions about *human Inventions*, the ground of the moſt uncharitable cenſures of the Worſhip of his Brethren.

He do's indeed in ſome caſes accuſe the Diſſenters of *laying aſide the commands of God* relating to his Worſhip (how juſtly, will appear hereafter). But I never find in his charge of *human Inventions*, that his premiſes amount to any more than ſome modes of Worſhip in general neceſſary, but in particular left to the determination of human prudence; And yet in his *Concluſion* he wou'd inſinuate into his unwary Readers, as if he had prov'd our Worſhip guilty of ſuch *ſuperſtitious Inventions*, as our Saviour's words, 7 *Mark* 7. caution us againſt. And ſo many Inſtances of this kind will occurr in the examination of the particular Chapters, as will ſpare me the labour of mentioning 'em here. I ſhall therefore here only add, That if this thin ſophiſm impos'd on his own underſtanding, 'tis great pitty he ſhou'd trouble the world with renewing a debate concerning theſe things, before he had better digeſted his thoughts about 'em; If it did not, where was his ſincerity in founding ſo heavy an Indictment on ſuch proof as he knew was ſo lame and inconſiſtent?

Leaſt therefore theſe Remarks ſhou'd be guilty of the ſame faults with his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, It will be neceſſary to ſet

theſe

theſe matters in a clearer light, which he has ſo ſtudiouſly wrapt up in perfect obſcurity.

I. This Phraſe of the *Inventions of men*, as relating to the *Worſhip of God*, occurrs *thrice* in our Tranſlation of the Bible, *viz.* 106 *Pſ.* 29. & 39 *v.* and 99 *Pſ.* 8 *v.* In the firſt place, 'tis applied to the people of Iſrael's *joyning in the ſacrifices offer'd to Baal-peor*; In the 2*d*, 'tis applied to their imitating the Heatheniſh Inhabitants in the Land of *Canaan*, in that horrid wickedneſs of *ſacrificing their children to Idols*. In the 3*d*, 'tis moſt probable by the Context, that the expreſſion referrs to the Worſhip of God by the *Golden Calf*, as an Image or ſymbol of his preſence. So that if we borrow our Notion of *human Inventions* in Religious Worſhip from the ſcriptural uſe of that phraſe, they always imply a violation either of the *firſt* or *ſecond* Command, either by ſetting up a wrong *Object* of Worſhip, or a forbidden and corrupt *way* of paying our worſhip to the true Object of it. And if the Biſhop had prov'd the Worſhip of Diſſenters guilty of ſuch *human Inventions*, he had done ſomething to the purpoſe.

II. But if we derive our Notion of the *Inventions of men* in the Worſhip of God, from that paſſage of our Saviour which the *Biſhop* cites from *Mark* 7. *v.* 7. *In vain do ye worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men*, a little care in examining it, will eaſily help us to ſtate it right.

By the *Commandments of men*, our Saviour here plainly underſtands ſuch, as enjoyn'd the doing or forbearing certain things as inſtances of Piety and Holineſs that recommend us to God, which he never preſcrib'd in the law of nature, or in his ſupernatural Revelation. Such Commandments of men he aſſerts thoſe Traditions among the Jews to be, that plac'd ſo much of holineſs in waſhing their hands before eating, or when they came from places of publick converſe, as if this external cleanneſs cou'd recommend 'em to the infinitely pure eyes of the great God. And many ſuch Inſtances of Apocryphal ſanctity occurr in the lives of

Popiſh

Popish Saints, who plac'd so much of it in so many unnecessary Austerities, and other trifling Popperies. And no wonder our Saviour shou'd condemn such human Traditions as thus tend to corrupt our apprehensions of the nature and will of God, and possess us with such a false idea of true Religion, as adulterates the simplicity of it.

These superstitious Precepts of men receive an Additional Aggravation, when the observing 'em necessitates the violation of the Laws of God, Thus our Saviour arraigns the superstitious Tradition of the Jewish Doctors about the obligation of *rash Vows*, which entangl'd 'em in the breach of the *5th Command*, 7 *Mark* 11. And on the same account we condemn those rash vows of *Celibacy* in the *Roman Church*, which so often involve those that make 'em in the violation of the *7th*.

Now if we apply this sense of the *Commandments of Men* to the Worship of God, we shall have a clear Notion of such *human Inventions* as this Text do's condemn, As,

1. It condemns as sinful *Inventions* or *Commands of Men*, all such as enjoyn some new part of Religious Worship that has no stamp of Divine Authority. As the Romish Church is herein guilty, when she presumes to add new *Sacraments* of her *own* to those of *Christ's* Institution,

And 'tis an aggravation of these sinful *Inventions of men*, when the observance of 'em is inconsistent with what God's own Laws prescribe relating to his Worship. Of which the Romish Church is guilty, in setting up *the Worship of Images, the Invocation of Angels and Saints, the offering up Christ as a Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Mass, and the Adoration of the Host.*

2. Whereas every part of Worship enjoyn'd by God, as *Prayer, Praise, &c.* is capable of being perform'd in various circumstantial modes; If the Law of God do expressly enjoyn us any particular mode, then, to devise another of our own exclusive of that which he has chosen and determin'd, is to bring in a sinful *human Invention* into his Worship. Such sinful *Inventions* are *prayers* and

praises

praiſes in an unknown Tongue, the *Communicating in one kind*, *ſolitary Communions*, *&c.*

3. Nay, if the Commands of men make ſuch *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of their own deviſing, as are no way neceſſary, nor warranted by any general Rules of Scripture, to become the ſtated Appendages of any part of divine Worſhip, and the neceſſary terms of Communion in it, ſuch Ceremonies ſeem to come within the compaſs of what our Saviour rejects as *vain worſhip*. For the impoſing ſuch Rites and Ceremonies, ſeems to be an Act of human preſumption that tacitly arraigns thoſe directions which God himſelf has given us concerning his Worſhip, and our Communion in it, as defective. And ſuch ſuperſtitious *Inventions of men* thoſe numberleſs *Rites* and *Ceremonies* ſeem to be, whereby the Guides of the *Roman Church* have corrupted the ſimplicity of Chriſtian Worſhip, and defac'd the true beauty and purity of divine Inſtitutions with the meretricious paint of their unneceſſary pomp and pageantry. And his Lp. wou'd have done well to have clear'd the *Croſs* in *Baptiſm* from being one of theſe *human Inventions*.

So that the *Inventions of men in the Worſhip of God* which this Text condemns, are always ſome ſinful *corruptions* of it, as to the *matter* or *manner* of it, or ſome ſinful *Additions* to it. If therefore his Lp. wou'd manage this charge of *human Inventions* to any purpoſe againſt the *Diſſenters*, he muſt prove either that they ſet up ſome new part of Worſhip which has no ſtamp of divine Authority; or that where God has determin'd any particular mode for ordering any part of his Worſhip, they reject that, and uſe one of their own deviſing; or that they introduce ſome new Rites as ſtated Appendages of worſhip no way neceſſary in general, and make 'em the terms of Communion in it. How little he has done of that kind, will appear in the examination of his enſuing Chapters.

I might add here, We may juſtly rank among ſuch *human Inventions*, all thoſe human Orders in reference to the Government and Diſcipline of the Church, that ſet up any ſuch new Officers in it without any warrant of Chriſt's Inſtitution as put down

thoſe

thoſe that he has appointed, or deprive 'em of any part of that power he has committed to 'em; Nay, all thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Canons are ſuch ſinful precepts of men as are inconſiſtent with the great Rules for unity and concord, for mutual forbearance and charity, *&c.* which our Saviour has laid down. And I ſhou'd be very glad if his Lp. cou'd clear the Eſtabliſh'd Church from the charge of ſuch *human Inventions* as theſe. For 'tis theſe are chiefly the fatal Engines of our Diviſions, as I may have occaſion to obſerve in the end of theſe Remarks.

III. It remains only that I ſubjoyn in order to the clearing the ſtate of this Controverſy, That there is a very improper ſenſe in which this phraſe of *human Inventions in the Worſhip of God* may poſſibly be us'd, *viz.* To ſignifie ſuch modes and circumſtances of divine Worſhip, as tho neceſſary in general by Divine precept, yet are left in particular to be determin'd by human Prudence. For tho God has commanded publick *Prayer, Praiſe, Hearing, Celebration of the Lord's Supper, &c.* Yet what time or place we ſhall aſſemble in, In what order theſe parts of Worſhip ſhall be perform'd, What particular devout poſture we ſhall uſe among ſeveral equally expreſſive of our religious Reverence, what Tranſlation of the Bible or Verſion of the Pſalms we ſhall chooſe, what portion of the Scriptures ſhall be read, explain'd and apply'd; What utenſils ſhall be employ'd in the celebration of the Sacraments, and a multitude of ſuch circumſtances and modes of that kind are left to human Determination. Only therein the general Rules of Scripture muſt be regarded, as *That all be done to Edification, and all things be done decently and in order*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 14. 26, v. 40. Now to call ſuch modes of Worſhip thus juſtly determin'd by human Prudence, the *Inventions of Men*, even ſuch as our Saviour refers to *Mark* 7. is indeed common enough with ſuch wild Sectaries, as the *Quakers*; but I am ſorry that his Lp. ſhou'd thus eſpouſe their Quarrel, and take up their Arguments againſt us. And yet I hope to make it evident, That his Proof of *human Inventions* in the Worſhip of Diſſenters amounts to no more then ſuch *prudential human Orders* about the modes of Worſhip, as are undoubtedly allowable

and

and lawfull; and That the *Eſtabliſht Church* is much more liable to the ſame charge, many of whoſe Practices as well as thoſe of *Diſſenters*, I ſhall be oblig'd in charity to defend from this weak and blind Accuſation.

What I have here ſuggeſted will make it needleſs to take any farther notice of the *Principles* his Lp. lays down in reference to the VVorſhip of God, then to annex theſe few brief *Remarks* on 'em.

For the 2 firſt, *That it belongs to God only to give Rules how he will be worſhip't, and that the H. Scriptures contain the Revelation of God's Will concerning his Worſhip*, They are no other then what will freely be granted him, unleſs he extend 'em to all *circumſtances* and *modes* of VVorſhip and exclude all human Prudence in the determination of 'em.

For the 3*d*. which he infers from the 2 former, viz. *That it concerns us to keep as cloſe as we can to thoſe Directions which God has been pleas'd to afford us in his Word, without adding to, omitting or altering any thing that he has there laid down.* I hope he intends no more by it, then that ſo far as God has by thoſe Directions enjoyn'd any part of Worſhip, or expreſly determin'd the manner and circumſtances of it, ſo far we muſt follow ſuch *Directions*; And therefore I hope he wou'd not hereby inſinuate as if thoſe *Directions* were ſo particular, as to appoint all the forementioned circumſtantial modes of Inſtituted worſhip. And I think this Caution the more needfull to be given him, becauſe the Reaſon he offers for this *Principle* carrys a very uncertain and dangerous ſound with it, viz. *For ſince God has vouchſaft us a certain Direction for his Worſhip in the H. Scriptures, It is to be ſuppos'd that all ways of Worſhip are diſpleaſing to him, that are not expreſly contain'd or warranted by Examples of H. M. therein.* If his Lp. had deſign'd our Inſtruction by theſe *Principles*, he ſhou'd not have deliver'd 'em to us (like the *Heathen Oracles*) in ſo *ambiguous* terms, as leave us to gheſs in the dark what he means. For how ſhall we know, Whether by God's giving us a *certain Direction* for his Worſhip, he means as to all the *parts* of it, or all the *circumſtantial modes*, and whether of theſe he intends by *ways of Worſhip*. For if

he

he intend the *latter*, (as any man wou'd imagine by the whole tenour of his following Diſcourſe, wherein he ſo often applys that phraſe, the *ways of Worſhip* to the *modes* of it) viz. *That God has given us ſo certain a Direction for his Worſhip, as to all the circumſtantial modes of it, that all ſuch modes of it are diſpleaſing to him that have not expreſs Scripture-Precept or Pattern.* This is ſo *wild* an Aſſertion, that I ſcarce think any more extravagant one ever dropt from the pen of the moſt weak and ſcrupulous *Sectaries*, and ſo very *uncharitable*, that if a man believ'd it, he wou'd find it hard to joyn in any Religious Aſſembly that I know of in the Chriſtian World, I am ſure he muſt renounce all Communion with the Pariſh-Churches; ſo fatal is it to great Wits to run into extremes, that his Lp. is not content with eſpouſing the *Diſſenters Principles* without *overdoing*, and ſtretching 'em beyond all tolerable bounds; ſo that if he ſhou'd ever become a Proſelyte to that Party, I am afraid hee'll turn one of thoſe rigid ones that were formerly call'd *Browniſts*.

For what he calls his 4*th* and 5*th Principle*, I know of no Diſpute there is about 'em.

But I muſt crave leave in order to the clearing my way to the following Chapters, to ſubjoyn 2 *Principles* or *Poſtulata* which his Lp. ſeems to have forgot, but are highly neceſſary to a right Judgment concerning theſe matters, *Viz.*

1. Where God has enjoyn'd any part of Religious Worſhip in general, but has not determin'd the particular mode and circumſtances of it, There the determination of 'em belongs to *human prudence*, and ſuch determinations of 'em are lawful and warrantable as are agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture given to direct us therein. And therefore there may be various *modes* of performing the ſame Religious duty, that are each allowable and lawful; tho ſome particular circumſtances may make *one* to ſome perſons more expedient than the *other*. *Ex. gr.* God has commanded us to pray, but he has no where expreſly determin'd (whatever his Lp. ſeems to inſinuate to the contrary) whether we ſhall pray *with* or *without* a *ſett Form of words*; both *ways* of praying there-

therefore may be lawful in general, tho particular circumſtances may to ſome render the *one* or the *other* way more convenient; nay the general Rule of doing all to Edification, may perhaps in ſome caſes oblige men to the *one*, and in ſome to the *other*. I might ſay the ſame concerning ſinging in *Proſe* or *Meetre*, *Reading* a *larger* entire portion of Scripture *without Expoſition*, or a *leſſer with it*, *&c.* So that in theſe caſes wiſe men are very cautious on what grounds they go, when they cenſure the Worſhip of others as unlawful, or charge it with ſinful *human Inventions*; and confident Accuſers do but uſually betray their own Ignorance.

2. We that are Chriſtians, ſhou'd chiefly attend to the *Rules* and *Examples* of the *New Teſtament* for our direction in the Worſhip of God. For thoſe of the *Old Teſtament* no farther concern us, than as any *Rules* deliver'd there belong to the *Moral Law*, and the *Reaſon* of ſuch *Examples* equally extends to us as it did to them. And indeed to urge the *Precepts* or *Patterns* of the Worſhip us'd under the *Old Teſtament* any farther, were to bring us again under the *Moſaical* Pedagogy.

And as I hope, None will deny me theſe 2 reaſonable *Poſtulata*, ſo the uſefulneſs of 'em in theſe Enquiries will appear in many of the *Remarks* on the following Chapters, which I ſhall now addreſs my ſelf to the conſideration of.

Remarks on the 1 *Chapter concerning Praiſes.*

AND here I ſhall ſo far obſerve the ſame method his Lp. has laid down, as *Firſt* to conſider the *directions of Scripture* concerning this part of Divine Worſhip, and then the *Application* his Lp. makes of 'em to the manner of performing it in the *Eſtabliſht Church*, and in the *Diſſenters Congregations*.

Firſt,

Firſt, As to the *Directions of the H. Scriptures* concerning this part of Divine VVorſhip, I ſhall offer what follows as the Reſult of the moſt diligent Enquiry I cou'd make, and hope 'tis a juſter as well as clearer Account than that his Lp. has given.

There are but theſe 2 ways of offering our publick *Praiſes* to God enjoyn'd in the *New Teſtament*, *viz.* either by *Singing Pſalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs*; or by *Thanksgiving without vocal Melody.*

I. As to *Thanksgiving without vocal Melody*, I wou'd obſerve,

1. VVe have moſt expreſs command for it as one principal ſtated part of our publick VVorſhip, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, *I exhort therefore, that firſt of all Supplications, Prayers, Interceſſion, and* giving of thanks *be made for all men, &c.* And this part of VVorſhip was uſually joyn'd with that of *Prayer*. Thus 4 *Phil.* 6. *In every thing by prayer and ſupplication with* thanksgiving, *let your requeſts be made known to God.* So 4 *Col.* 2. — 1 *Theſ.* 5. 17, 18. And accordingly, *Bleſſing*, or *Giving of Thanks* is mention'd as one ſtated part of the *Devotions* of *Chriſtian Aſſemblies*, 1 *Cor.* 14. *v.* 16. And that thoſe *Thanksgivings* were different from *Pſalms* or *Songs* is hence evident, both becauſe they were to be varied according to their different occaſions for 'em from the mercies they daily receiv'd, which ſuch *Pſalms* or *Songs* cou'd not be, (For thoſe are always ſuppos'd to be a ſett invariable form of words); and becauſe they were ordinarily intermixt with publick Prayer.

2. For the matter of theſe *Publick Thanksgivings*, the *New Teſtament* chiefly directs us to inſiſt on thoſe peculiar mercies of God to us thro a Mediator, which the Goſpel moſt clearly reveals to us, and of which there is either none, or but very obſcure mention made in any Forms of *Thanksgiving* recorded in the *Old.*

For if we go thro all the ſolemn *Thanksgivings* that occur in the *New Teſtament*, we ſhall find 'em to run in a ſtrain as much ſublimer than that of thoſe in the *Old*, as that *clearer* tranſcends that *obſcurer Revelation.* How ſutable to the Evangelical diſpenſation is that *Thanksgiving* of the Ap. *Paul's* 1 *Eph.* 3. 4, 5, *&c. Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who has bleſt*

us with all ſpiritual Bleſsings in heavenly things in Chriſt, According as he hath choſen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we ſhou'd be holy and blameleſs before him in love, Having predeſtinated us to the Adoption of children by Chriſt to himſelf, &c. Or *that* of the ſame *Inſpired Writer*, 1 *Col.* 12, 13. *&c.* Of the ſame ſtrain is that of the Ap. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 1 *Ch.* 3, 4, *&c. Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who according to his abundant mercy has begotten us again to a lively hope by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead, to an Inheritance incorruptible, undefil'd, and that never fades away, reſerv'd in Heaven for us, &c.* See 1 *Rev.* 5. 6. *unto him that lov'd us, and waſh't us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts to God, &c.* 5 Rev. 13, 14, &c.

Theſe are certainly the beſt *Patterns* after which our publick *Thanksgivings* in *Chriſtian Aſſemblies* ſhou'd be drawn. And no *Thanksgivings* recorded in the *Old Teſtament* do ſo expreſly and clearly mention theſe ineſtimable bleſſings of the New Covenant, or the matchleſs love of our God and Saviour in the manner of conferring 'em, as theſe recorded in the *New*; and conſequently our *praiſes* ſhou'd ordinarily, as to the very matter of 'em, greatly differ from, and go beyond thoſe us'd in the *Jewiſh Church*.

3. We read of no other part the people had in theſe publick *thanksgivings* in the *New Teſtament* more than their adding their *Amen* to 'em. So much theſe words of the Ap. *Paul* imply, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16. *Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupies the room of the unlearned ſay Amen at thy giving of thanks.* All Expoſitors on the place refer it to the cuſtom of the people's ſaying *Amen* at the end of *publick prayers* and *praiſes*. I might produce the teſtimony of *Juſtin Martyr* and other ancient Chriſtian Writers of the 3 firſt *Centuries* to this purpoſe; but ſince the *Biſhop* ſeems to allow this Expoſition, *p.* 42. I need inſiſt no farther on it here.

And 'tis the more requiſite to take notice of this *way* of *prayſing* God by *Thanksgivings* without vocal melody, becauſe the *Bp.* ſeems to confound it with that other *way* of *prayſing* God with *Pſalms*,

&c. which (he tells us) *amounts to praiſing God by way of Reſponſes, becauſe propheſying* (he ſaith) includes *Pſalms, Doctrines, Tongues, Revelations* and *Interpretations*, *p.* 11. But 'tis ſtrange his Lp. ſhou'd examine his criticiſms no better. For if he compare the 26 *v.* of that Chapter with the 6*th*, he'll eaſily find that *propheſying* inſtead of including all thoſe things mention'd *v.* 26. is diſtinguiſht from 'em, *v.* 6*th*; And if he'll compare this 31 *v.* with thoſe that precede, and thoſe that follow it, he cannot but ſee, that it imports only a direction to the Prophets to ſpeak in their due order without interrupting one another, ſince that God, in whoſe name they ſpake, *was not the Author of confuſion, but of peace, v.* 33. And accordingly ſome judicious Expoſitors underſtand theſe words, *v.* 32. [*The ſpirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets*] of thoſe that were inſpir'd, being capable of refraining to ſpeak even what they had an impulſe for, till they cou'd do it in regular order.

IV. For *Inſtruments* of *Muſick* there's no Queſtion of their being us'd in the Worſhip of the *Jewiſh Church*. But then it muſt be conſider'd, that 'tis highly probable theſe Inſtruments of Muſick belong'd not to the Worſhip of their Synagogues, but only to the ſervice of their Temple. And there was a particular Inſtitution for 'em, as appears from *Numb.* 10.— 32 *Levit.* 23, 24. And thoſe other Inſtruments of Muſick which *David* appointed, 1 *Chron.* 16. 4, 5. he is expreſly ſaid to have done it upon the Commandment of the Lord by his Prophets, 2 *Chron.* 29. 25. And they are on that account call'd God's Muſical Inſtruments, 1 *Chron.* 16. 22.— and 2 *Chron.* 7. 6. as having the ſtamp of his Authority. Nor dos the ſingle inſtance of *Miriam*'s Timbrels ſignify any more to prove that the uſe of 'em was no part of the Ceremonial Law, than the uſe of Sacrifices before *Moſes*'s time can prove that they were not. Beſides, *Miriam* being there call'd the Propheteſs, there is juſt reaſon to ſuppoſe that ſhe us'd thoſe Timbrels upon a particular impulſe, as *David* is ſaid to have inſtituted his upon ſuch a particular command from the inſpired Prophets. Since then Inſtrumental Muſick belong'd to the *Temple-ſervice*, which was but

ceremonial and typical, it muſt be aboliſht with that ſervice; And we can have no warrant to recall it into the Chriſtian Church without as particular an Inſtitution for it, as it had under the Law, any more than we have to uſe other abrogated rites of the *Jewiſh Religion.* Nor needs there any particular command for laying it aſide, when the whole *Temple-ſervice*, of which 'tis a part, is ſo plainly caſhier'd, and it was not, that we can find, us'd in the Worſhip of the *Synagogues*, from which alone we can pretend to draw any ſafe Pattern for Evangelical Worſhip. And 'tis certain that there's no mention of it's being us'd in the Worſhip of the *Chriſtian Church.* And indeed it ſeems more ſutable to divine Worſhip when there was more of external pomp allow'd in it. I confeſs his Lp. would perſuade us the Apoſtles recommend ſuch muſical Inſtruments, becauſe the Ap. *James*, when he exhorts thoſe that were *merry* to *ſing Pſalms*, uſes the word Ψαλλέτω, 5 *James* 13. which he tells us, ſignifies in the Original, ſinging with an *Inſtrument*, *p.* 13. But ſure his Lp. can lay no ſtreſs on this Argument, when 'tis ſo apparently weak, and ſo often concludes wrong. Of which I ſhall give him a parallel inſtance of his own. He tells us, *p.* 111. that προσκυνέω (the word generally us'd in the *New Teſtament* for Worſhip) ſignifies in the Original, to pay homage by kiſſing the hand. And might he not as wiſely infer from thence, that we are ſtill oblig'd to pay our external homage the ſame way. But if he look again on that paſſage of the Ap. *James*, he will find this ſlender criticiſm too weak a foundation for Organs to ſtand on, becauſe the Apoſtle cou'd not reaſonably ſuppoſe all thoſe to have Inſtruments of Muſick by 'em, or to be capable of uſing 'em, whom he there exhorts to vent their ſpiritual joys, by ſinging of Pſalms. Since then there is no warrant for Inſtrumental Muſick, from either precept or example in the *New Teſtament*, the Bp. is oblig'd by his own principles on that account to turn it out of the Church. And indeed for the Cathedral Muſick, 'tis hard to reconcile it with 1 *Cor.* 14. 11, 15, 26. For the *Apoſtle* requires that all things be done to Edification, and conſequently that no worſhip be offer'd up but what is clearly underſtood; ſince if we know not

the

the meaning of the voice of him that ſpeaks, he is but a Barbarian to us; Now the generality of the people complain that the Chaunters and Choriſters are juſt ſuch Barbarians to 'em, becauſe their voice is not ſo articulate as to enable 'em to underſtand what they play or ſing.

Secondly, Having conſider'd the *Directions* of the *Scripture* relating to this part of Religious Worſhip, Let us conſider the *Application* thereof to the Praiſes of God as celebrated in the *Eſtabliſht Church*, and in the *Diſſenters Congregations*.

And before I enter on the *Repreſentation* that his Lp. gives, I ſhall only briefly ſuggeſt, That 'tis evident from the foregoing ſcriptural Account, That the *way* of *praiſing God* among the *Diſſenters*, is exactly ſuited to the *precepts* and *examples* of the *New Teſtament* relating to this religious duty. For they *praiſe God* both.

1. By *ſolemn Thanksgivings*, and thoſe ſuited to that glorious Revelation of the Goſpel, and the peculiar Subjects of Praiſe it furniſhes us with, not excluding what the Providence of God towards his Church or towards our ſelves do's ſuggeſt as matter of our grateful acknowledgments.

And theſe are ſo ſtated a Part of our Worſhip that the *Directory* requires the Miniſter either in his Prayer before, or that after *Sermon*, to offer ſuch *Thanksgivings*, and accordingly ſuggeſts theſe Heads of 'em, admirably agreeable to the ſtrain of the Goſpel,

He is to give thanks, for the great Love of God in ſending his Son Jeſus Chriſt to us, For the Communication of his H. Spirit, for the light and liberty of the glorious Goſpel, and the rich and heavenly Bleſſings reveal'd therein, as namely Election, Vocation, Adoption, Juſtification, Sanctification, and hope of Glory; For the admirable goodneſs of God in freeing the Land from Antichriſtian Darkneſs and Tyrany, and for all other National Deliverances &c. and for many temporal Bleſſings.

2. By ſinging of *Pſalms*, *Hymns* and *ſpiritual Songs* in which duty they conſult the Peoples edification by putting ſuch Metre verſions of the *Pſalms* of *David* into their hands, as adapt 'em for this

this use of 'em which the Scripture enjoyns. And I am sure those in use among 'em, as the *Scots*, *Barton's* or *Patrick's* versions are incomparably better then that obsolete one which is still retain'd in the Parish-Churches, tho for what reason is hard to imagine, unless it be from a spleen against Reformation, of which some think the least step very dangerous.

One would think then our manner of Praising God were unexceptionable. But his Lp. it seems has very different apprehensions of this matter, of which he gives us this Summary and very strange Account.

" The Case then between our Church and you in this point, I " think impartially stands thus. Our Church Praises God every " Day with 5 or 6 *Psalms*, besides other *Hymns* of his own Ap- " pointment, and in his own Words and Method, and yet is de- " serted and condemn'd by you in this very point, as teaching " for Doctrines the Commandments of men; Whereas you who " only Praise him in a piece of a Psalm of a few verses, and in a " method of your own finding out, persuade your selves that you " keep the Ordinances of God pure and unmixed from human " Invention.

And this his Lp. Recommends to the serious consideration of Dissenters, as they will herein expect to bear the Tryal of God's Judgment in this matter, p. 24.

Answer: I must confess my self amaz'd to read these words, and am willing rather to impute 'em to his forgetfulness and inconsideration, then to arraign his judgment or sincerity. But he is so far from having sum'd up this matter with the *impartiality* he pretends to, that he has been so *unfortunate* as scarce to have said one true word in his Representation on either side. As will appear upon a particular Examination.

" Our Church (saith he) praises God every Day with 5 or 6 " Psalms, besides other Hymns, of his own Appointment, and in " his own words and method.

What do's his Lp. mean? Has God indeed appointed the Psalms of *David* to be the stated Forms of Thanksgiving in the Christian Church,

Church, as Thanksgivings are diſtinguiſht, from *Pſalms, Hymns* and *Spiritual Songs*, (as I have ſhewn him they plainly are)? He is ſo far from having prov'd any ſuch thing, that ſince his Lp. has learnt us the way of challenging, I muſt uſe the freedom of demanding his Proof of it; For I take it to be a raſh Aſſertion, and of dangerous conſequence. I have ſhewn him already that the *New Teſtament* recommends no other uſe of the *Pſalms* of *David* in our publick Praiſes except *ſinging* 'em; Nor indeed are they expreſly mention'd at all, tho we ſuppoſe 'em intended in 5 *Eph.* and 3. *Col.* But when the Ap. *Paul* ſo often commands us to *to give thanks for all* men, *In all things to give Thanks*, to joyn Thanksgiving with all our Prayers, he never recommends the *Pſalms* of *David* as *Forms* of ſuch *Thanksgivings*. And no wonder, For beſides that we have frequent particular Occaſions of publick Thankſgiving, which there is nothing in the *Pſalms* adapted to, even the *Pſalms* themſelves do not contain the principal matters of Chriſtian *Thanksgivings*; For they make no expreſs mention of the infinite love of God the Father of our Ld. *J. Chriſt* in ſending his own Son, as our great Prophet, to reveal his will to us, and dye for us as our Attoning *Sacrifice*, that he might redeem us by his precious blood; in raiſing him from the dead; exalting him to ſuch glory and dignity as the Head of his Church, and Head over all things to it; and in appointing him the *Author* of Eternal Salvation to all that believe and obey him. Nor do they ſo clearly mention theſe great and precious promiſes made to us thro this Mediator of a better Covenant, eſpecially thoſe that relate to our adoption, and to the heavenly glory. And yet theſe and the like inſtances of the matchleſs love of God diſcover'd to us in *J. Chriſt* (that glorious mirrour of divine love) are ſo proper matter for our expreſs grateful acknowledgments, that they ſhou'd make up the principal part of our publick Thanksgivings, as they do in all thoſe ſolemn ones recorded for our imitation in the *New Teſtament*; And indeed without 'em, this part of Worſhip in a Chriſtian Church wou'd be moſt groſsly defective and unſuitable to the Goſpel as the laſt and cleareſt Revelation of the will of God. I deny

not but we may in our Chriſtian Thanksgivings, make uſe of the expreſſions of H. *David*, when we celebrate God's works of Creation, or of his common or ſpecial Providence, becauſe ſo far they contain ſutable matter of Praiſe for a Chriſtian as well as for a Jewiſh Aſſembly. But for celebrating the great work of Redemption, which ought to be the chief work of our Praiſes on that day, which is now call'd the Ld's day (as being conſecrated to the glory of our Redeemer, as Lord of the New Creation) 'tis evident the *Pſalms* of *David* cannot ſerve us, but we muſt derive the ſubject of thoſe Praiſes entirely from the *New Teſtament*. And therefore to ſuppoſe, as the Bp. here dos, that the *Pſalms* of *David* are to be the chief ſtated part of our Chriſtian Praiſes, is no better than to reduce the Chriſtian to the imperfection of the *Jewiſh Church*. And this is ſo plain, that as I obſerv'd before, when the Ap. recommends the ſinging the *Pſalms* of *David*, yet he joyns *Hymns* and *Spiritual Songs* with 'em, which no doubt were to run in a ſtrain more ſuited to the Evangelical diſpenſation. I confeſs the Bp. has found out a wonderful knack of turning the *Pſalms* of *David* into *Chriſtian Hymns*, by adding the *Gloria Patri* to 'em, as if that *Doxology* alter'd the matters of *Praiſes* contain'd in 'em.

So when he ſaith, *Our Church praiſes God with* 5 *or* 6 *Pſalms and other Hymns of his own Appointment*, Why dos he call the *Thankſgiving* of *Zacharias*, the Virgin *Mary*, and *Simeon*, *Hymns*, which the Scripture calls not ſo? And why dos he take it for granted inſtead of proving it, that God has appointed what they ſpake on that occaſion for ſtated forms of *Thanksgivings* in all Chriſtian Aſſemblies, when there is ſo much in 'em ſuited to the particular caſe of thoſe perſons, that tho they are uſeful for our inſtruction, yet they are not calculated for forms of *thanksgivings* to us. If we muſt chooſe forms out of the Scripture, the Apoſtolical ones I produc'd under the head of *Thanksgivings*, will far more exactly ſuit us.

Again, when he ſays, *Our Church praiſes God with* 5 *or* 6 *Pſalms, &c. in his own words and method.* Why dos he groundleſly imagine the *words* of the Proſe-tranſlation of the *Pſalms* to be more the

the *words of God* than the *words* of a Metre-tranſlation, that do as truly expreſs the ſenſe of the Original? Nay, why dos he pretend that they praiſe God by *Pſalms* in his own method, when they have ſo plainly deviated from his method in the following Inſtances. As,

1. In the Cathedrals where the *Pſalm* is ſung by the Quire, 'Tis none of God's method that the greater part of the people ſhou'd be excluded from joyning in his Praiſes thro their incapacity to ſing 'em in Proſe. For (beſides the probable Arguments alledg'd before to prove that the *Pſalms* were compos'd and ſung in metre by the Jews) this is plainly diſagreeable to the Ap's Rule, that all things ſhou'd be done to Edification.

2. In the Pariſh-Churches when the *Pſalms* are only *ſaid*, not *ſung*, they are ſo far from uſing God's method, that their practice has neither Scripture-precept nor pattern, but is one of the Bp's *human Inventions*. Nay, 'tis diſagreeable to the precepts of the *New Teſtament*, which enjoyn the *ſinging* of Pſalms in our praiſes; and thro his Lp. pretends a diſpenſation for *ſaying* 'em, I have ſhewn him the invalidity of his proofs for it, ſo that we have only his bare word for it.

3. The method of *Reſponſes* in the Pariſh-Churches, as applied by them to all *Pſalms*, even thoſe wherein there is no variety of matter, nor different perſons introduc'd as ſpeaking in 'em, is unſcriptural, and generally ſcarce agreeable to common reaſon, or to the rule of *decency* and *order*, that where the ſenſe is continued thro ſeveral verſes, it ſhou'd be interrupted and broken, by being toſt between the Miniſter and People, juſt as in the *Litany*, the Miniſter and People make up the Prayer between 'em. So that this is another of the Bp's ſort of *human Inventions*.

The Bp. adds, *Our Church praiſes God with* 5 *&c. and yet is deſerted by you in this very point, as teaching for doctrine the Com-Commandments of men.*

Anſw. If he means that ſome weak people may alledge ſuch reaſons for their deſerting the Eſtabliſht Church, becauſe they think theſe unſcriptural practices I have laſt mention'd, ſuch ſuperſti-

ſtitious commands of men as our Saviour ſpeaks of, 7 *Mat.* 7. 'Tis indeed poſſible it may be true; for who can be reſponſible for all that injudicious people ſay? But I know none of the *Non-conf.* Writers that have condemn'd 'em as unlawful, or applied that Text to prove 'em ſo. But I muſt tell his Lp, That if any ſhou'd paſs this harſh cenſure on 'em, he is the only perſon I know of, that has furniſht 'em with an Argument *ad Hominem*, which I know not how he can Anſwer. For what if they ſhou'd reaſon thus, That way of Worſhip is diſpleaſing to God, which is neither expreſly contain'd in, nor warranted by the Examples of H. Men in Scripture, being one of the commandments of Men condemn'd by our Saviour, 7 *Mark* 7. but the way of Praiſing God with *Pſalms* and *Hymns* without ſinging 'em and of uſing Reſponſes in all *Pſalms*, is neither expreſly contain'd in the H. Scriptures, nor warranted by the Examples of H. Men therein, and yet 'tis the general Practice of all the Pariſh-Churches E.... The firſt Propoſition is entirely his own; The ſecond I have *prov'd* in theſe Remarks, and ſhew'd that his Inſtances to the contrary ſignifie nothing to his purpoſe, let himſelf therefore look to the Concluſion.

And as he has ſo palpably miſrepreſented matters on his own ſide, ſo he has done it much more *foully* on the Diſſenters. Concerning whoſe practice his words are.

Whereas you who only Praiſe him in a piece of a Pſalm of a few verſes, and in a method of your own finding out, perſuade your ſelves that you keep the ordinances of God pure and unmix'd from human Invention.

Anſwer. I deſire his Lp. when he is pleas'd to examine theſe matters over again to give us ſome reaſon why he ſo confidently tells us, that the *Diſſenters only praiſe God in a piece of a Pſalm.* Do's he not know that publick Thanksgivings without vocal melody, are a Scriptural way of praiſing God, and moſt expreſly enjoyn'd for that end, as a ſtated part of the Worſhip of Chriſtian Aſſemblys, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. and mention'd as their conſtant Practice, 1 *Cor.* 14 16? And dos he not know that ſuch ſolemn Thanksgivings

ings are a ſtated part of the Worſhip of Diſſenters? He cannot pretend Ignorance of this, when he has ſo diligently Read the Directory, out of which I have quoted him, the heads of ſuch Thanksgivings; and if he compare 'em with the patterns of Apoſtolical Thanksgivings I mention'd before, he'll find they are exactly drawn after their excellent Copy. Nor cou'd he be Ignorant that the Directory enjoyns ſuch Thanksgivings to be conſtantly joyn'd with the Prayer before, or after Sermon, (as the *New Teſtament* alſo directs us to offer 'em up together) unleſs he read it with ſo partial an eye, as to overlook its excellencys, and only ſpy its defects. And I muſt add, that the practice of *Diſſenters* in this part of publick Worſhip to the utmoſt of my obſervation, is very conformable to this Rule of the Directory. So that his Lp. is oblig'd to do us right, by rectifying this palpable miſtake concerning this part of our Worſhip, and wou'd do well to underſtand our Worſhip better before he undertake to repreſent it with ſo confident pretences to impartiality.

I wou'd here only ſubjoyn, That ſuch ſolemn Thankſgivings as theſe, are undoubtedly of God's appointment. For if he pretend, that they are not offer'd in any words that God has immediately dictated (as he tells us, their Church praiſes him in his own words). I anſwer, That cannot be juſtly imputed to us as a fault, unleſs God had been pleas'd to dictate ſuch Forms of Thankſgiving to us; which if he can ſhew us, he will make the happieſt diſcovery that ever man yet did, and ſuch a one as will ſoon end all our Debates about this matter. But I am afraid he muſt bring a new Bible for that purpoſe; for I can find no ſuch in that we have. And indeed if God had provided ſuch Forms of Thankſgiving for the Chriſtian Church, What need were there of any *human Liturgy* for this ordinary part of our Worſhip? What need thoſe few *Collects* of *Thanksgiving* (and indeed too few, and too defective) which occur in the *Common-Prayer-Book*? Or how cou'd any on this ſuppoſition excuſe their Arrogance in adding to the Forms God has already preſcrib'd, or annexing thoſe that are of *human Compoſure* to thoſe that are of *divine*? But I hope he'll pretend

no more to produce any such. For as to the *Psalms*, I have shew'd him before that they were never intended for such Forms of *Thanksgiving* to the Christian Church; whose *Praises*, if confin'd to the matter of 'em, wou'd be extremely defective, and unanswerable to the Christian Institution, which so far transcends the *Mosaical Oeconomy*.

For what his Lp. saith *of the Dissenters praising God only in a piece of a Psalm of a few verses, and in a method of their own finding out*, I shall only add to what I have already suggested, the following Remarks.

1. That I think the *Dissenters* sing as much, and usually much more of the *Psalms* of *David* every Ld's-day, than they do in the *Parish-Churches*. In most they sing 'em thrice, in some four times. Nor do I know of any obligation laid upon us to sing a whole Psalm every time, especially the longer ones, and the shorter they often sing whole.

2. That tho our method of singing 'em in metre require something of human skill to adapt 'em for that use, yet 'tis no more than what those Scriptures warrant, nay plainly oblige us to, that require our singing 'em joyntly in publick Assemblys, and to do it in a way most conducive to Edification.

His Lp. indeed tells us, *That he takes it for granted, that the Apostles and primitive Christians prais'd God in prose, and that metre and rhime are, for ought appears, of human Invention.* But is it not strange that his Lp. shou'd confound those two ways of Praising God, which the *New Testament* so clearly distinguishes? That they prais'd God with *Thanksgivings* in *Prose*, is unquestionable; but that they prais'd God in *prose Psalms*, is, as I have shown him, highly improbable. For as in some *Psalms* there is *plain* evidence of *metre*, so we have great reason, from the testimony of *Josephus*, to judge the same of the rest. And therefore his conceit that the Spirit of God gave no gifts for composing Psalms in verse, in opposition to the Heathens, who wrote their *Prophecys* and *Hymns* in verse, is a meer invention of his own: For as there is so clear proof that some of the Psalms were inspir'd in verse, and

so

ſo great probability the reſt were, ſo many judicious Expoſitors do conclude the quite contrary, from 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. where *Pſalmeſtry* ſeems to be intended as one of thoſe extraordinary gifts; And 'tis far more probable that the Spirit of God by enjoyning the ſinging of *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Spiritual Songs*, did intend to reſcue ſo noble a thing as *Poetry* from its wretched abuſe by the *Heathen Prieſts*, that it might be conſecrated to the ſervice of God in his *Temple*, and become an incentive and help to true *Devotion*. So that our way of uſing Pſalms is far more clearly of God's Appointment, becauſe more conformable to his particular direction for ſinging 'em, and to his general Rules of doing it to Edification, than theirs wherein they differ from us, as when they are among them only *ſaid* not *ſung*, or *ſung* in *proſe*, not in *metre*, and that only by the leſſer part of the Congregation.

So that upon the whole, I cannot ſee the leaſt reaſon why the *Diſſenters* ſhou'd in this point be afraid of the Judgment of God, to the Rules of whoſe Goſpel this part of their devotions is ſo exactly conform'd; or why they ſhou'd be aſham'd to appeal herein to the judgment of all unprejudic'd men. Nay, I hope they may venture to appeal to his Ep's own judgment, when he is at leiſure to review this matter, and correct his own unhappy miſtakes about it.

I ſhall therefore conclude this Chapter with a few Remarks on ſome paſſages that occur in his *2d* and *3d Section*; As,

1. I ſee no reaſon why his Lp. ſhou'd think the force, vigour, and loftineſs of the *Pſalms* any more loſt in a *metre* than in *proſe-tranſlation*, *p.* 19*th*.

'Tis true indeed, the *metre-tranſlation* of *Hopkins* and *Sternhold* is but ill done, ſo is that *proſe-tranſlation* which the *Common Prayer-Book* ſtill uſes. And it ſeems an unreaſonable humour to retain both, when there is both a *proſe-and metre-tranſlation* far more unexceptionable. The *metre-verſion* commonly cali'd the *Scots*, is far better than that us'd in the Pariſh-Churches. *Barton*'s exceeds that, and Mr. *Patrick*'s (if he had not taken too great a liberty of paraphraſing) excels both; and I doubt not, if a judici-

ous

ous perſon wou'd undertake the work, 'twere eaſily poſſible to have a *metre-verſion* that wou'd exceed the *proſe* in all theſe advantages; And ſuch a one wou'd be of extraordinary uſe to raiſe the devotion of the people in this part of divine Worſhip.

2. The Bp. tells us, *p.* 21. *that we have a command to tranſlate the Pſalms which ſuppoſes into proſe (becauſe the Original is ſo) but none to turn 'em into metre, &c.* Now if, on the contrary, the *Original* was compos'd in *metre* (as I have ſhew'd to be moſt probable) then, by his own Argument, the command to tranſlate 'em, ſuppoſes it muſt be done into *metre*, becauſe the *Original* is ſo. And therefore the Bp. has in that and the following page, not only groundleſly ſuppos'd the true ſenſe of *David's Pſalms*, when turn'd into *metre*, to be none of God's word, but has on that account unreaſonably excluded 'em from being any ſubſtantial part of God's Worſhip, and ſpeaks ſlightly of 'em, as if they were intended for little better than a pleaſing diverſion and amuſement. Now if he really believe what he ſaith, I think he ſhou'd in all reaſon warn the People againſt their preſent Practice. For 'tis certain they do by ſinging 'em in time of publick Worſhip, intend 'em as a ſubſtantial part of it, and will be ſurpriz'd to find this uſe of 'em cenſur'd as an human Invention; whereas if on the contrary the ſinging 'em in Metre be moſt conformable to ſcriptural Precept and Pattern, and bare ſaying 'em diſſonant from both, the Bp. can never excuſe himſelf on his Principles from thus preferring one of his human Inventions to a Divine Inſtitution.

As to the imperfect way of ſinging the Pſalms by reading every line, 'tis indeed a defect, but ſuch as we muſt be forc'd to condeſcend to, unleſs we cou'd prevail with all our People to get Pſalm Books and learn to Read, or to commit 'em to memory.

3. I wonder why his Lp. ſhou'd charge the *Diſſenters* with aſſerting *Reſponſes*, in publick Worſhip to be *unlawful*, *p* 23. If he alledg the idle talk of ſome weak people to that purpoſe, is it Ingenuous in him to mention that as the general Opinion of *Diſſenters*? What if we ſhou'd in Retaliation pick up all the weak and fooliſh cenſures of thoſe of his Communion and charge 'em on the Conformiſts

formiſts in general? wou'd he take this well? If not, why dos he forget our *Saviours* Rule, not to do others what he wou'd not they ſhou'd do to him, 6 *Luke* 31. But as it is ſufficient to juſtifie our diſuſe of *Reſponſes* that we have neither *Precept* nor *Example* for their being us'd in a Chriſtian Church, ſo he has the leaſt reaſon to blame any weak *Diſſenters* for cenſuring 'em as unlawful, ſince he has put the moſt dangerous Argument to Prove 'em ſo into their mouths, and if I did not know his Principle to be erroneous, I ſhou'd joyn with 'em in that cenſure.

As to *Church-Muſick*, I ſhall only add, That what is commonly us'd in the Cathedrals, ſeems at leaſt to be very ſuſpicious, and hardly conſiſtent with the Rules of the Ap. 1 *Cor.* 14 11, 15, 26. which I mention'd before; and this ſort of *Muſick* has indeed been ſeverely cenſur'd by many Proteſtant Divines at home and abroad, nay by many Papiſts themſelves, who confeſs it to be unknown in the Church in its pureſt Ages, and but à late invention, which thoſe that trace it the fartheſt, referr no higher than Pope *Vitalian*'s time about the year 690, but others make it of a much later date; *Aventinus*, and *Anoimus* in their Hiſtories mention *Organs* as a Rarity never ſeen in *France* or *Germany* before the *7th. Century*; Nor were they in general uſe in *Aquinas* * his time, as *Cajetan* obſerves upon his ſo freely declaring his judgment againſt 'em. Even *Eraſmus* himſelf (who, tho he favour'd the Reformation, yet was cautious and ſlow enough in his advances towards it) cou'd not forbear to complain of this in the *Romiſh Church* as an abuſe, which he thought needed to be reform'd, as both unſutable to the gravity and ſolemnity of Chriſtian Worſhip, and needleſly expenſive, by introducing a crew of chargeable creatures into the Church, to no good purpoſe, or rather to an ill one. His words on 1 *Cor.* 14. are theſe, *Operoſam quandam & theatricam Muſicam in ſacras ædes induximus, tumultuoſum diverſarum vocum garritum, qualem non opinor in Græcorum aut Romanorum Theatris unquam auditum fuiſſe. In hunc uſum magnis ſalariis aluntur puerorum greges, quorum ætas in perdiſcendis hujuſmodi*

* *Aq. Sec. 2dæ Q. 91. Art. 2. ad. 4.*

modi gannitibus conſumitur. Tantis ſumptibus oneratur Eccleſia ob rem peſtiferam, &c. "We have brought a cumberſome & theatrical "Muſick into our Churches, a confus'd noiſe of many voices, ſuch "as I think was never heard in the *Greek* or *Roman Theaters*. For "which purpoſe whole Troops of Boys are maintain'd at great "charge, whoſe time is waſted in learning this Gabbling. Such "expence is the Church burden'd with for a thing that is but miſ-"chievous, *&c.* I wou'd therefore adviſe his Lp. to be more cautious of cenſuring their Opinion, (*who make ſuch Muſick in the Worſhip of God unlawful*) *as againſt nature and Scripture, and on that account a dangerous ſuperſtition and encroachment on Chriſtian liberty.* For as to the Scripture, it has certainly no foundation there in any precept or example that concerns us Chriſtians; and ſure he dos not imagin that the light of Nature dictates ſuch Muſick in the Worſhip of God, for then he muſt make it more neceſſary than he himſelf pretends to do. And it looks more like ſuperſtition, according to his own notion of it, to introduce ſuch Muſick into the Church without any ſcriptural ground; And he may be ſure, the *Diſſenters* are not the more fond of it for being one of Pope *Vitalian*'s inventions, and retain'd among us in conformity to the practice of the *Romiſh Church*. I confeſs if any uſe of Organs be allowable, 'tis that in the Pariſh-Church of directing the people into the Tune of the *Pſalms* they ſing, and 'tis on that account chiefly that the Reverend Mr. *Baxter* thinks 'em lawful and allowable. But as this very uſe of 'em is certainly deſtitute of any ſcriptural precept or pattern obligatory to us Chriſtians; ſo however others may entertain a more charitable opinion of 'em, yet the Bp, if he will be conſiſtent with himſelf, muſt condemn 'em as a *human Invention*, and (to uſe his Countreymen's phraſe) muſt turn the *Whiſtles* out of the *Kirk*.

Remarks

Remarks on the Second Chapter concerning Prayer.

AND here according to his Lp's method we muſt conſider,

1. The *Directions* of the H. Scriptures in reference to this part Religious Worſhip, Of which it will be neceſſary to give a fuller and more exact account than his Lp. has done, and to ſhew how far I agree with, or diſſent from that he has given. And here I ſhall trace his ſteps, and conſider what occurs to this purpoſe in the *Old Teſtament* and the *New*.

Firſt, for the *Old Teſtament*.

I. *I grant him that in ſome particular caſes God did recommend to the Jews a Form of Words in their Addreſſes to him.*

Such a *Form* that *Confeſſion* he mentions ſeems to be, which the people were to make when they entred into the Land of *Canaan*, upon their offering the *firſt-fruits*, 26 *Deut.* 3, 5. Such a *Form* alſo, was the *Prayer* mention'd in the ſame Chapter, *v.* 13, 14, 15. which was to be preſented by him that gave the third years *tyths*. And by the way it may be obſerv'd, that neither of theſe *Forms* related to the publick Worſhip celebrated on their weekly *Sabbath*. Such a *Form* of *Bleſſing* I doubt not that mention'd, 6 *Numb.* 23. was. And 'tis highly probable that *Form* of words was repeated in the ſeveral Removes of the Ark, 10 *Numb.* 35.

But then I muſt add, that for the other paſſages he alledges as Inſtances of *Forms*, They are either only directions as to the matter of *Prayer*, or no Inſtances of *Forms* at all, but rather of *free*, or (as he calls 'em) *extempore-prayers*.

Thus

Thus 'tis not reaſonable to underſtand the words of *Joel*, 1 *ch.* 14. 2 *ch.* 17. of any more than the Prophet's ſuggeſting to 'em ſutable matter of Complaint and Supplication; For ſure he cannot imagine that the Prophet intended they ſhou'd repeat only thoſe few words when they were to *ſanctify a Faſt, and call a ſolemn Aſſembly.* If indeed the Prophet had made mention of a *Liturgy* they had already, and had charg'd 'em to add theſe words as a new *Form* to it, Theſe inſtances had been ſomething to the purpoſe; but ſince there's not the leaſt intimation of any ſuch thing, we can no more conclude theſe words to be intended for a ſtated *Form*, than thoſe words form'd into Petitions which Miniſters often in their Sermons ſuggeſt to the people when they inſtruct 'em in the duty of Prayer; And I might on the ſame grounds ſay, That all the *patterns* of Prayer in the *Directory* are preſcrib'd *Forms.* The ſame may be ſaid as to the paſſage quoted from 14 *Hoſ.* 2. On which place Dr. *Comber* (from whom our Author ſeems to have tranſcrib'd the greateſt part of this *Section*) very boldly tells us, but on no other warrant then his own word, that *God promis'd to heal their backſlidings on their uſing that Form.* It is enough to make us more ſuſpicious of *Forms* when men turn 'em into *Charms* by attributing ſo great Effects to the uſe of 'em. But 'tis ſtrange that his Lp. ſhou'd imagine thoſe words mention'd in that large Prayer of *Solomon*, 1 Kings 8. 47. (*We have ſinned, we have done perverſly, we have committed wickedneſs*) to be a *Form* of *Confeſſion* preſcrib'd to the *Jews*, meerly becauſe the ſame words are repeated, in a very large *Pſalm* mixt of *Confeſſion* and *Thanksgiving*, *viz.* 106 *Pſ.* 6. and in another different *Confeſſion* of *Daniel's* 9 *ch.* 5? When not only, are theſe very words repeated in both thoſe places with different additions to 'em, but thoſe 2 larger *Confeſſions* are in quite different words. And the making uſe of theſe words of *Solomon* in each of 'em, is ſo far from proving a preſcrib'd *Form*, that by the ſame Argument he may call all *extempore-prayers Forms*, becauſe there are ſeveral *Confeſſions* and *Petitions* in 'em put up in ſcriptural Expreſſions. And yet his Lp. lays ſo great ſtreſs on this

Orig. and Uſe of Lit. p. 3*d.*

this Inſtance, as to tell us with admirable confidence, *That it appears from hence that they were not left arbitrarily to choyce and diſcretion, tho other words might be joyn'd with 'em when there was occaſion to enlarge or vary the Form.*

Anſw. What did not the Pen-man of the 106 *Pſ.* think himſelf left to his choice, when he enlarges *Solomon's Confeſſion* that makes up but one verſe into a Pſalm that conſiſts of 48 verſes? And did not *Daniel* think himſelf left to his own choice, when tho this large *Confeſſion* in the 106 *Pſ.* was prepar'd to his hands, yet he uſes another of his own quite different from this, becauſe more ſutable to the ſenſe he had of the preſent condition of the *Jewiſh Church*? So that theſe 2 *Confeſſions*, inſtead of being inſtances of Prayer by a *preſcrib'd Form*, are plain inſtances of *occaſional* and *free*, (or, as he calls it, *Extempore*)-*Prayer*.

The ſame may be applied to thoſe words, 106 *Pſ* 47. quoted from 1 *Chron.* 16. 35. For ſure the uſe of a few words recorded in one *Pſalm*, in the compoſure of another, when all the reſt of the *Pſalm* in each is quite different, is but a very lame proof of a preſcrib'd *Form*, and furniſhes us rather with a ſtronger Argument to the contrary.

So that the Bp. had better have confin'd himſelf to Dr. *Comber's* proofs, than add ſo impertinent ones as theſe, which make rather againſt him; And I wonder he omitted that very convincing one for the Antiquity of *Liturgys*, which the foreſaid Dr. draws from the 4 *Gen.* 26. *Then men began to call upon the name of the Lord.*

All then that can be inferr'd from what is granted him, is, *That God did in ſome few caſes preſcribe to the Jews a Form of words, and when he did ſo, they were oblig'd to uſe it. So that this mode of Praying by a ſett Form of words, is not in general unlawful.* And if this Conceſſion will do his Lp. any ſervice, he is welcome to it.

II. *I ſee not the leaſt Evidence in the Old Teſtament of a ſtinted*

Liturgy preſcrib'd by God to the Jewiſh Church, even as to their ordinary publick Prayers.

And if ſuch a *Liturgy* be that which the Bp. intends to aſſert when he tells us, *p.* 25. *That the Scriptures direct us to offer up our Prayers in a ſett and prepared Form of words*, I muſt deſire his Lp. to bring us better proof of it, than what he has alledg'd from *p.* 25. to *p.* 29. and I have here examin'd. To which he adds what I wou'd now farther conſider, " That the whole Book of *Pſalms* " is a collection of Prayers of all ſorts. And there are few of " 'em, but what are moſt excellent Forms of Prayer, expreſs'd " in ſuch pathetick, ſignificant and moving words, that we have " great reaſon to thank God for furniſhing us with 'em, and " which we can never hope to equal by any of our own inven- " tion, ſuch as are the 4, 5, *&c.* On this Account they were us'd " by the *Jews* as the conſtant ſervice and *Liturgy* perform'd in " their *Temple*, as we may gather from what I formerly quo- " ted.

Anſw. Why he ſhou'd call the whole Book of *Pſalms* a collection of *Prayers* of all ſorts, when the far greateſt part of 'em are undoubtedly *Prayſes*, as diſtinguiſht from *Prayers*, I know not. That ſome *Pſalms* conſiſt much of Petitions, and conſequently may be call'd *Prayers*, I doubt not. But then he ſhou'd have conſider'd that theſe *Prayers* are compos'd in the ſtrain of *Songs*, and moſt probably in *metre*, and were deſign'd to be *ſung*, as appears concerning thoſe he mentions, *viz.* the 4*th*, 5*th*, 6*th*, 7*th* 9*th*, 10*th*, 12*th*; all of which (except the 10*th* that has no Title) are directed to the *chief Muſitian*, or expreſly aſſerted to be *ſung*. Now 'tis certain ſuch *Pſalms* of *Prayer* as are intended to be publickly *ſung*, muſt be *ſett forms*; But there is no neceſſity that other ordinary *Prayers* ſhou'd be ſuch *ſett forms* that were never compos'd in that manner, nor deſign'd for that uſe. And therefore 'tis ſtrange that he ſhou'd think the quoting the 2 *Chron.* 29. *v.* 30. a ſufficient proof, that theſe *Pſalm-prayers* were us'd by the *Jews* as a conſtant *Service* and *Liturgy* perform'd in their *Temple*, if by *Liturgy* he means ſuch *proſe-prayers* as our *Liturgy* conſiſts of,

of, and about which we are now only concern'd to enquire. For that Text ſpeaks not one word of *Prayers* at all, but only of *Prayſes*, and if it had mention'd or included *Prayers*, it cou'd refer to no other *Prayers* but ſuch as were *ſung*, which we all agree muſt be *ſett forms*. And theſe *Pſalm-prayers* the Bp knows the *Diſſenters* he oppoſes never ſcrupl'd. For they are uſeful to be *ſung for Inſtruction* by thoſe, who cannot offer 'em up as properly a *prayer*, becauſe their condition and circumſtances are no way like the Pſalmiſt's, when he compos'd 'em. But the Queſtion is concerning *prayers* in the proper ſenſe, ſuch as are not *ſongs*, but compos'd in *proſe*, and in the ſame ſtyle as our other ordinary requeſts are; for ſuch are the prayers of the *Engliſh Liturgy*, and 'tis for ſuch a *Liturgy* the Bp. is oblig'd to produce us ſome *precept* or *pattern* in the H. Scriptures And theſe Inſtances of *pſalm-prayers* ſignify nothing to this purpoſe. Nor indeed do we among all the inſtances of publick *prayers* recorded after the time of the Pſalms being penn'd find one of theſe *pſalm-prayers* us'd; But on the contrary, thoſe that do occur are plainly *free* and *conceived prayers*, ſuch as the preſent occaſions of preſenting 'em did draw from the devout minds of the pious ſupplicants. Of which I ſhall give ſome inſtances under the next head. I ſhall only add, That if the *Biſhop* think theſe *pſalm prayers* of *H. David* better for our uſe than any of human compoſure, why dos he not lay aſide all the *Collects* of the *Common prayer-book* that are certainly of *human Invention*, and confine himſelf to the *Pſalter* as his only *Liturgy* for *prayer* as well as *praiſe*? What can excuſe his uſing worſe, when he has better? Or rather why ſhou'd he imagin 'em intended for *forms* of *proſe-prayer* to us at all, any farther than *David*'s devout expreſſions may be us'd ſo far as they ſuit our caſe, when the *New Teſtament* ſo largely inſtructs us to offer our *prayers* in ſo different a manner from that practis'd in the *Old*, particularly with a more expreſs reference to *J. Chriſt* as our great Mediator of Interceſſion, nay when the Goſpel more clearly furniſhes us with ſutable matter of Prayer, by that fuller Revelation it brings of the divine Will to us.

III. *God*

III. *God was so far from confining the Jews to any stinted Liturgy, that most of the prayers, both private and publick recorded in the Old Testament, are conceiv'd or free prayers, without any sett or prescrib'd Forms.*

Such were most of the private Prayers mention'd in the sacred History. What prescrib'd *form* had *Abraham*'s Servant, when he so heartily prays, (24 *Gen.* 12, 13.) for success in the errand on which his Master had sent him, to fetch a Wife for his Son *Isaac*, unless it had been compos'd for him by a spirit of prophecy? *Abraham*'s prayer, 20 *Gen.* 17. was doubtless occasional and *extempore*. So was *Jacob*'s for deliverance from his Brother *Esau*, 32 *Gen.* 9 So are many of *Moses* on particular occasions of God's displeasure against the people, 32 *Exod.* 11, 12, *&c.* 31, 32, *&c.* No doubt *Hannah*'s Prayer for Children was of this sort, and that too after she had obtain'd what she desir'd, 1 *Sam.* 1. 10. 2 *Sam.* 1, *&c.* Such was *Hezekiah*'s when visited with sickness, 38 *Is.* 3. And such was *Nehemiah*'s, mention'd 1 *ch.* 4, 5, 6, *&c.* It were endless to produce all the particular instances of this kind; And 'tis plain these holy men wou'd have been at a sad loss how to address themselves to God on such occasions, if they cou'd not have pray'd without a Book, or had been ty'd to *sett forms*. But they needed no Prompter, when their necessities suggested arguments and expressions, and *out of the abundance of the heart their mouths spake.*

For *Publick Prayers* there are no less clear Instances of such as were *conceived* or *free*, even after the *Psalms* of *David* were penn'd, which the *Bp.* imagines to have been the Jewish *Liturgy*. Such was that Excellent Prayer of *Solomon's* upon the Dedication of the Temple, 1 *Kings* 8. 22. Such was that of *Asa* when that vast *Ethiopian* Host came against him, 2 *Chron.* 14. 11. such was that of *Jehoshaphat* on a like occasion, 2 *Chron.* 20. 5. *&c.* That of *Hezekiah* in reference to *Rabshekah's* blasphemous Threats was an Instance of either private or publick free Prayer, 36 *Is.* 15, 16. Of the same kind was *Ezra's*, 9 *Ezra.* 5, 6, 7. The Confession in *Nehemiah* 9 *ch.* 5, 6, 7. *&c.* is not taken from any precedent *Form*, but wholly

wholly new. And yet 'tis evident that in most of these cases those Holy Men might have made up *Forms* of *Prayer* for those occasions out of H. *David's* words in some of the *Psalm prayers*, but they chose rather to offer up such Prayers as the serious sense of their present case did suggest to 'em, and that made 'em ready suppliants to God for Relief, without the need of seeking out a prescrib'd *Form* for their purpose.

Now as the Bp. may safely infer from God's having recommended a *Form* of words in Prayer in reference to some cases, that *prayer* by a set *Form* is not in it self *unlawful*, so I may much more infer from these more numerous Instances of *free prayers*, That our *prayers* according to the Examples of these H. Men, shou'd be accommodated to our several particular occasions and necessities, and therefore 'tis so far from being *unlawfull*, to use *conceived or free prayers* without any prescribed *Form*, that to tye up our selves to such sett and prescribed *Forms* will not ordinarily answer the frequent Calls which we have in the Providence of God to this holy Duty, by such various Emergency's as no sett *Forms* can Exactly suit.

Nay whereas the *Bp.* can infer no more from his Instances then that when God prescribes us a *Form* we shou'd use it, and he approves our doing so, we may from these Examples last produc'd with equal reason infer, that we may use *free prayer* in those occasions, in which God has not prescribed us any such *Forms*; and that he do's approve this way of addressing our selves to him, with such Prayers as the feeling of our own necessities and consideration of our particular case dos prompt us to offer.

I shall only add, That if there be no Evidence of such a stinted *Liturgy* in the *Jewish*, we can much less expect any proof of one in the *Christian Church*, because such a *Liturgy* if necessary at all, was much more so under the *Old Testament*, when there was not such an abundant Effusion of the H. Spirit in his Graces and Gifts as now under the *New*. Nay if the *Jewish* Church had no stinted *Liturgy* prescribed by God, much less had any uninspired men any power given 'em to prescribe one, and confine all publick Administration

niſtrations to *Forms* of their own Compoſure. But this will lead me to conſider the *Directions.*

Secondly, Of *the New Teſtament.*

And here I ſhall firſt conſider thoſe 2 things the Bp. inſiſts on, and then ſhall propoſe ſome farther account of the directions that occur in reference to the mode of Praying in this part of the H. Scriptures.

I. I ſhall conſider thoſe 2 things the Bp. inſiſts on in favour of Praying by preſcrib'd *Forms,*

1. *I think it* (ſays he) *certain that our Saviour and his Apoſtles prayed by a Form, for they joyn'd in the Worſhip of the Temple and Synagogues, which conſiſted in Pſalms, as I have already ſhew'd, and in ſome certain Forms of Prayers added to 'em, and conſtantly us'd in their daily ſervice, as we learn from thoſe that give an Account of the Jewiſh Worſhip at that time. Now our Saviour and his Apoſtles being frequently preſent at their ſervice both in the Temple and Synagogues, 'tis manifeſt they approv'd their manner of addreſſing themſelves to God by ſett Forms,* p. 30. 31.

Anſw. That our *Saviour* and his *Apoſtles* pray'd by a *Form* when they us'd the *pſalm-prayers,* there is no doubt, and ſo do all thoſe that ſing 'em. That there was a ſtinted *Liturgy* beſides, or a collection of *Forms* of proſe-prayer to which the publick Adminiſtrations were confin'd to the excluſion of occaſional free Prayer, the Bp. has no where prov'd; and the contrary is far more probable from many inſtances of ſuch free-prayer in the *Old Teſtament,* which I have before alledg'd. Nay, ſhou'd we, to oblige his Lp, grant him, that ſome *forms* of *proſe-prayer* were ordinarily us'd in the Jewiſh Worſhip (tho we muſt do it on the uncertain credit of *Rabbinical* Writers, whoſe teſtimony is of little value, and not on the teſtimony of the H. Scripture) yet I ſee not how the Bp. can make any more of this, than that our Saviour thought it not unlawful to joyn in ſuch publick *forms* of *proſe-prayer,* but it will by no means follow, that he preferr'd ſuch pub-

lick

lick *forms* before *free-prayers*, and design'd by his practice to recommend the *former* to the Christian Church to the exclusion of the *latter*. (For as I shall shew him anon, there are strong presumptions to the contrary) And yet unless his Lp. cou'd draw this Inference from our *Saviour's* and the *Apostles* practice, I see little service it can do him. Nay I fear, if the Argument from our *Saviour's* and his *Apostles* practice herein be urg'd so far, it will prove much more than those intend who use it. For it will prove that we ought in imitation of their example, to retain and adhere to that *Liturgy* which these Gentlemen pretend the *Jews* had, (and which they tell us they can yet produce the particular parts of), to whose forms of Prayer Dr. *Comber* tells us, that our *Saviour* added his, and was herein *so afraid of Innovation as to take every sentence out of the jewish Forms then in use* *; If so, why is not this *jewish Liturgy* still us'd by us? If we must have a stinted *Liturgy*, such a one were most unexceptionable, as we are sure our *Saviour* approv'd by joyning in? Why then shou'd ordinary Pastors presume to frame *Liturgys* of their own, and use that liberty in composing 'em, which our Saviour was too modest to allow himself? And why shou'd they impose so *many forms* on others, when our great Master impos'd but *one*, and such a one as he borrow'd the very sentences of from the Forms then publickly us'd. So that these Gentlemen shou'd, if they will be consistent with themselves, plead for laying aside our *Liturgy*, and using that old one which Dr. *Lightfoot* has so happily retriev'd for us out of the Jewish *Rabbins*. I wou'd therefore advise 'em to use this Argument from the practice of the Jewish Church in our Saviour's time (about which we are at the best but very uncertain) with great tenderness and caution, least they overdo with it, and least the *jewish Liturgy instead* of *under propping* the *Common-Prayer-Book*, *undermine and throw it down.*

* *Orig. of Lit. p. 6.*

2. He tells us, *p.* 31. *That our Saviour has put this matter out of all dispute with impartial men, by prescribing a Form to his Disciples, when they desired him to teach them to pray as* John *did his Disciples.*

ples. For we find his way of teaching 'em was not by directing 'em to wait for the impulſes of the Spirit and immediate Inſpiration from God, of what they were to offer up to him; We do not find him ſaying, When ye pray ſpeak what ſhall then come into your minds, or what ſhall be given you in that hour, without taking thought about what they ſhou'd ſay, &c. But here is an expreſs command of Chriſt to his Diſciples to uſe theſe words when they pray.

Anſw. His Lp has a very happy faculty of arguing matters of Diſpute before he ſtate 'em, For indeed the ſtating 'em might chance to ſpoyl all the force of his Arguments; and therefore he generally thinks it more adviſeable to let that alone. He tells us, *Our Saviour has put this matter out of all Diſpute with impartial Men by preſcribing a Form to his Diſciples.* What matter of Diſpute dos his Lp. mean? Is it whether a *form* of *Prayer* be lawfull? Or is it, whether our Saviour has preſcrib'd a ſtinted *Liturgy* to the Chriſtian Church in their publick Adminiſtrations, or whether he has commiſſion'd Ordinary Paſtors to preſcribe and impoſe ſuch a *Liturgy*, and confine others to the uſe of it? Or whether he in general enjoyns us to pray only by a *Form*, or not ordinarily without one? If he mean the firſt, (*whether a Form of Prayer be lawfull?*) That's no matter of Diſpute at all, between the *Diſſenters* and the *Eſtabliſht Church*, for as I ſhall ſhew him anon, there is never a Meeting in which they do not uſe one, and there are many in which this particular *form* of *prayer* is conſtantly us'd. So that if this be all he wou'd prove he may ſpare his labour, tho perhaps his Arguments for this are not altogether ſo convincing and ſolid as he imagines. If the Queſtion be, (*whether our Saviour has preſcrib'd a ſtinted Liturgy to the Chriſtian Church?*) as one wou'd think it ſhou'd, What ſignifies his preſcribing this *ſingle form*, to the proof of it, unleſs the Bp thinks our *Liturgy* ſhou'd conſiſt only of that *one prayer*, or cou'd produce more *forms* preſcrib'd by our Saviour to make up a *Liturgy*; And if he cou'd do that, what will become of the *Service-Book*, What have we to do with that *human Invention*, when we have a *Liturgy* appointed and compos'd by our Saviour himſelf? If the Queſt. be, (*Whether our Saviour has commiſſion'd*

miſſion'd the ordinary Paſtors of the Church to preſcribe and impoſe publick Forms?) what dos all he here alledges about this *ſingle form* preſcrib'd by Chriſt, ſignifie to prove any ſuch thing, when he can produce no ſuch commiſſion, nor the leaſt ſhadow of it in all the *New Teſtament*, nay when the Rules of it about Prayer ſeem rather inconſiſtent with any ſuch Commiſſion (as I ſhall ſhew him anon)? If the Queſt. be, (*Whether our Saviour in general enjoyns us to pray only by a form, or not ordinarily without one?*) what dos any thing his Lp. has alledg'd ſignifie to the right determination of this Queſtion? If he deſign to prove that Chriſt by preſcribing this *form*, has enjoynd in general our Praying only by a *ſett form* and never otherwiſe, (as one wou'd think his following words wou'd import, when he tells us, "That our Saviour's teaching "'em was not by directing 'em to wait for the impulſes of the "Spirit, and immediate Inſpiration from God of what they were "to offer up to him; We do not find him ſaying, when ye pray, "ſpeak what ſhall come into your minds, or what ſhall be given "you in that hour without taking thought about what they were "to ſay), he knows well enough his Argument is no way concluſive; For he himſelf owns that God *has not forbidden all extempore prayers*, nay owns *that ſome occaſions require the uſe of 'em in publick*, and *that in ſuch caſes a man may depend on the aſſiſtance of God's Spirit when he has not time to reduce his deſires into form before he offers 'em, p.* 54. 55. He cannot therefore, without contradicting himſelf, pretend that our Saviour, by preſcribing this *form*, intended to exclude all *extempore* or *free prayer*. Nor is there any force in the Argument to prove that our Saviour intended to oblige us ordinarily to pray by a *form*, becauſe he once preſcrib'd *one* as a comprehenſive ſummary of our deſires. For his general Rules (as I ſhall obſerve anon) do far more directly favour and countenance *free prayer*, than this one inſtance dos the uſe of *forms*, eſpecially of *forms* impos'd by others, about which the main diſpute lyes. And what he has here offer'd to confirm it, ſignifies nothing to the purpoſe; or if it did, wou'd prove too much. For our Saviour may teach men the way of free prayer, without *directing*

'em to wait for the Impulses of the Spirit and immediate Inspiration from God, since none pretend to such impulses and immediate inspiration as necessary in order to it. He himself owns, that in cases of necessity we may depend on the *assistance of the Spirit* to pray *extempore*, and yet he dos not, I hope, mean we may expect such *immediate inspiration*. Nay, our Saviour may advise us to *free prayer* without telling us, *We must speak what comes into our minds, or shall be given us in that hour, without taking thought what we are to say*. For *free prayer* is so far from excluding serious premeditation, that no man shou'd use it, especially in publick, without it, unless in cases of absolute necessity. Nay, if this reason signify'd any thing, it wou'd prove too much, that we are never to pray *extempore* at all, because we have no ground even in cases of necessity to expect such *immediate Inspiration*. And here I wou'd once for all, caution his Lp. against that common mistake he seems to run into, as if we imagin'd the assistance of the H. Spirit in Prayer to lye in immediately dictating our words to us, Whereas we no more expect that in *Prayer* than in *Preaching*. For we suppose this Gift of Prayer to be a common gift. And tho we have known many private Christians, whose natural parts in all other things are but weak and low, endued by the Spirit of God with a considerable measure of this Gift, as the fruit and reward of their diligence in this duty, Yet we doubt not that many natural Endowments, as readiness of apprehension, copiousness of fancy, tenderness of affection, fluency of expression may contribute much to dispose a man for greater eminency in it; Nor do we think the assistance of the H. Spirit in this duty alters that style or way of expression that nature or custom has habituated men to. So that the H. Spirit is no more accountable for the indecent expressions of good men in *Prayer* than in *Preaching*, tho we may expect his help both in our endeavours to *acquire* abilities and gifts for these duties, and in the *exercise* of 'em.

But before I dismiss what he hath said in reference to this Prayer of our Lord, I shall subjoyn the following Remarks thereon.

1. If

1. If it should be granted that our Saviour gave this as a Form of Prayer to his Disciples, and intended it for the perpetual use of his Church, yet no more can be infer'd from thence than our obligation to use that *particular Form*. For if he had intended our ordinary use of other Forms, 'tis reasonable to suppose he wou'd have prescrib'd 'em himself, or commission'd his Apostles to do so, or instructed them to leave some orders with other ordinary Pastors to have compos'd 'em.

2. Many learned men that do allow the Lord's Prayer to have been a prescrib'd Form, do not think it design'd for the perpetual use of the Church, but only for a *temporary Form*.

To this purpose they observe that the three first Petitions [*Hallowed be thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done, &c.*] seem to be chiefly calculated, both to the doctrine which *Christ* as well as *John* deliver'd concerning the *Kingdom of God being at hand*, and to the expectation the pious Jews then generally entertain'd of the *Messiah's Kingdom* being publickly set up in the world; They observe farther, that in the Petition for *forgiveness of sins*, There is not the least mention made of the *sacrifice*, the *death*, or *blood* of Christ, in vertue whereof we must now sue for pardon; whereas our Saviour after his Resurrection and Ascention is every where propos'd, as our High-Priest, Mediator, Intercessor and Advocate, of which there is no notice taken in this Form. And hence they suppose that 'tis on this account that our Lord long after the delivery of this Form tells his Disciples, 16 *Joh.* 24. *Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my Name*, and therefore he requires 'em *now to ask the Father in his Name*, and assures 'em he will *grant their Petitions*. And accordingly they observe that the *Doxologys* mention'd in Scripture after our Saviour's Ascension, lead us directly and expressly to ascribe our Praises to God *by Christ*, or *in his Name*, of which there is not the least hint in that us'd in the *Ld's Prayer*. Whence they conclude it to be chiefly suited to the state of the Disciples of Christ, while under his personal Ministry on Earth, in which the principal mysteries of the Gospel that depended on his Death, Resurrection and Ascension were not yet so

clearly

nearly reveal'd. And the more some labour to prove these Petitions taken out of some *Jewish Forms*, the more do they strengthen this Opinion, That this Form was no farther intended for our use than as a Pattern in respect of the things pray'd for, but was not so much as to be a Pattern in respect of the manner of praying. In which respect 'tis most reasonable to suppose our manner of praying shou'd greatly differ from that of the Jews, particularly by being offer'd up in the name of Christ.

I do not give this opinion as my own, but propose it to his Lp's. consideration, to allay that confidence wherewith he asserts so positively our obligation to the constant use of the *Lords Prayer*; for which I do not see any thing so Plausible and Probable produc'd by him, as the Authors of this Opinion alledg in favour of it. For he tells us without any limitation that we are *particularly Commanded whenever we pray, to use this Prayer.* For which Assertion I can see no shew of Proof. Nor can I reconcile it to those many Instances of Prayer recorded in the *New Testament*, in none of which do we Read of this being us'd. Nay I do not think his Lp. or any Man else supposes himself oblig'd to use the *Lords Prayer* always; we pray whenever we crave a *Blessing* on our food, But dos his Lp. always use the *Lords Prayer* on that occasion? So that we must be cautious of stretching our Saviours words too far; For if we shou'd take 'em in their most strict sense, we shou'd never offer up any other Prayer but that at all.

3. The compilers of the *Directory* seem to give the most fair and just Account of the *Lords Prayer*, viz. That it was chiefly design'd as a *perfect Pattern*, but may also be conveniently us'd as a *Form* of *Prayer*.

That 'tis a *perfect Pattern* his Lp. will not deny, and the admirable method and order as well as the comprehensiveness of it's Petitions shew it be so as to the matter of Prayer. And the words of our Lord seem to recommend it also as a fit Compendium and Summary of our Desires. Tho that it was so strictly intended for a *Form* as that all alteration of the words in it shou'd be so dangerous as the Bp. suggests, I do not see. And 'tis strange he shou'd

no

no better ward off the common objection againſt this conceit, *viz. That the words of the Prayer are not the ſame in the 2 Evangeliſts.* For tho we ſhou'd allow him that *treſpaſſes* and *debts* are the ſame in the *Syriack*, yet ſure he cannot be ignorant that not only are the words different in the 4*th. Petition*, but what is more material, the *Doxology* is left out in the Evangeliſt *Luke*, where our Saviour's words ſeem more expreſs for the uſe of this *Prayer*. Nay 'tis pleaſant that his Lp. ſhou'd, to aggravate the danger of altering the words, compare it to the danger of *altering thoſe of our Creed*, *p.* 35. As if he did not know, that the words of it have been frequently alter'd, that no writer in the 3 firſt *Centuries* has the *Creed* (call'd the *Apoſtle's*) in the ſame words that we have now, and that the Forms we meet with in *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Gregory Neocæſar* are all in different words, nay in ſome Forms ſeveral Articles are inſerted that are not in others, Nay in the *Creed* as we have it, no doubt the Article of *Chriſt's deſcending into Hell* ſhou'd be alter'd as to the words of it, becauſe we do not commonly take *Hell* for the inviſible ſtate which ἅδης was deſign'd to expreſs. I confeſs 'tis ſomething more formidable when he compares the danger of altering the words in the *Lord's-Prayer* to that of *changing the word given by the General in a Battel*, *p.* 35. Tho where the wit or ſenſe of the compariſon lies, I cannot imagine, unleſs his Lp. thinks the bare words of that Prayer to be as frightful to the Infernal Fiends as ſome crafty Prieſts have pretended the Name or Pſalter of the *Virgin Mary* is, but apprehends thoſe our ſpiritual enemies will reſume their courage if we make the leaſt change in 'em.

I ſhall only add here, That his Lp. has not produc'd any other inſtance of a preſcrib'd Form of Prayer in the *New Teſtament* beſides this; He dos indeed, *p.* 50. tell us, *That Chriſt in his Agony repeated a verſe of the* 22*d Pſalm, and as ſome believe* (ſays he) *the whole Pſalm, by which Act he recommends to us Forms of Prayer with his dying breath, as the moſt proper means of expreſſing our condition to God, and as moſt ſutable to the divine Majeſty.* To which I ſhall only return this brief Anſwer, That his Lp. wou'd have done

well, *first* to have told us, what grounds any have to believe that our Saviour repeated the whole Pſalm, and *if he did not*, how the repeating one verſe of it ſo applicable to his preſent caſe, ſhou'd be a proof of his uſing a *form* of Prayer at all, and much more how it ſhou'd prove his *recommending ſuch forms to us with his dying breath, &c.* As if a man might not in a *free prayer*, chooſe out and apply ſome ſcriptural expreſsions to his own caſe. Indeed the words he quotes are not properly a *Prayer* at all, and if they were, look altogether as like an inſtance of *occaſional free-prayer*, ſo that if I wou'd argue at this looſe rate, I might with as good reaſon pretend that our Lord recommended *extempore-prayers with his dying breath, &c.*

II. *The Bp. has not produc'd the leaſt evidence of Chriſt's enjoyning or recommending to Chriſtian Churches the uſe of ſtinted Liturgys even as to the ordinary publick Prayers which they are to offer up.*

So that tho the ſame matters of Prayer conſtantly occur in that duty when publickly offer'd eſpecially in the celebration of *Baptiſm* and the *Ld's-Supper*, yet neither dos our *Saviour* nor his *Apoſtles* preſcribe any ſtated *forms* for 'em. Whereas if our Lord had judg'd 'em ſo neceſſary, or ſo highly uſeful as ſome pretend, Nothing cou'd have been more conducive to have fixt the uſe of 'em, and prevented all corruptions in 'em, as well as ſcruple about 'em, than to have furniſht the Church with a Divinely inſpired Liturgy. Nay, what is more conſiderable, *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* content themſelves with giving us general commands to *pray*, and with *all prayer* and *ſupplication for all men, &c.* but never gave the leaſt order to the Paſtors of the Church to compoſe *forms* of Prayer for publick Worſhip, in thoſe *Churches* that were planted and ſettled under the care of *ordinary Teachers*, who had not the ſame immediate Inſpiration as the *Apoſtles* themſelves: Dos not this plainly imply that they took not ſuch an *impoſed Liturgy* to be neceſſary to the Churches Edification and Peace? but rather ſuppos'd that the ordinary occaſions of publick Prayer were too various and different to be confin'd to ſuch ſett and preſcrib'd

ſcrib'd *forms*? If it be pretended, there was no need of their preſcribing ſuch *Forms* when the *Jewiſh Liturgy* was ſtill extant and us'd, I anſwer, That (not to repeat what has been objected againſt the pretenſions of a ſtinted *Liturgy* among the *Jews*). I hope none can imagin that a *Jewiſh Liturgy* cou'd be ſutable to the Chriſtian *Occonomy* after our Saviour's Aſcenſion, in the Chriſtian Churches that were planted by the Apoſtles. So that if a *Liturgy* in general were neceſſary to the Chriſtian Church, there was the greater reaſon why they ſhou'd have ſubſtituted *one* in the room of the *Jewiſh* in the *Churches* they ſettl'd; Since then they no way ſo much as recommend ſuch a *Liturgy*, but left even ordinary Paſtors to the free exerciſe of their own abilities, in Prayer as well as in other parts of their publick miniſtrations, We may with great probability infer that they judg'd it more conducive to Edification that the Paſtors of Churches ſhou'd uſe thoſe ordinary gifts wherewith they were furniſht for the performance of this duty without being ty'd up to any *ſett-forms*; And accordingly thoſe that have been moſt anxiouſly concern'd to find out *fixed* and *ſtinted Liturgys* in the 3 firſt and pureſt Ages of Chriſtianity, have but loſt their labour, and have but trifled with us in their moſt confident pretences to diſcover ſuch *Liturgys*. As appears by Mr. *Clerkſon's Diſcourſe of Liturgys*, and Mr. *S B's Examination* of Dr. *Comber's Anſwer in his Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the uſe of Liturgys*.

III. *'Tis evident, That the general Rules of Scripture cannot be duly obſerv'd by thoſe that pray no otherwiſe than by a ſett Form of Words.*

They command us to pray with *all Prayer and Supplication, and for all men, In every thing to make known our Requeſt to God*, 6 *Eph.* 18. —4 *Col.* 6.— 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, *&c.*

Now 'tis evident there is a vaſt *variety* of occaſions and emergencys in which we ſhou'd apply our ſelves to God by Prayer, which it cannot be expected any preſcribed *Forms* ſhou'd exactly ſuit. This is moſt obvious in our *Cloſet-prayers*. There is ſcarce any one day in which we have not ſome occaſion to vary our

our Requeſts. There are ſome particular failings we have occaſion particularly to confeſs, renounce, and implore divine Aid againſt; Or there are ſome particular dutys which we need to beg direction and aſſiſtance for the diſcharge of. So that our own meditation every day muſt ſuggeſt to us the moſt proper matter of our addreſſes to God, and many requeſts ſutable to our particular caſe muſt be excluded, if we confine our devotions to the *ſett forms* of others. So that ſuch as are at preſent forc'd thro their Ignorance, and inability to confine themſelves to ſuch *Forms*, are like *lame* People that cannot go without the help of *Crutches*; And for ſuch ſo to ſit down and ſatisfie themſelves with their Book-prayer and preſcrib'd *Forms*, as to go no farther, wou'd be (to uſe the ſignificant expreſſions of the excellent Biſhop *Wilkins*) *as if a Man who had once need of crutches ſhou'd always afterwards make uſe of 'em, and ſo neceſsitate himſelf to a continual Impotency.* Nay the Bp. himſelf cou'd not but own that the uſe of *conceiv'd prayers* is founded on that general Rule of Scripture, which *Commands us to ask of God what we lack*, p 56. But then he groundleſly adds the following words which 'tis moſt proper I ſhou'd conſider in this place. viz. " of this Rule our own " Prudence makes the Application in ſuch extemporary occaſions, " but when we ſet up this human Application of this general Rule " in oppoſition to that particular manner of asking Commanded " by God, and Practis'd by H. Men, which is by ſett and premeditated Forms, in the ordinary Worſhip of God, and turn God's " way out of his worſhip to make room for one of our own, This " is to diſplace a particular Command of God on pretence of guiding our ſelves by a general one; In which we are not only more " liable to miſtakes, but we fail of paying due reſpect to God's " directions. For general Commands only take place in ſuch " Caſes where God has not laid down a Particular Rule.

Anſw. His Lp. here very Prudently takes for granted what he has no where Prov'd, that God has given a particular Command to the Chriſtian Church to Pray in all ordinary caſes by ſett and premeditated *Forms*. But has he brought any other Proof of this then

then that Christ once Recommended one comprehensive *Pattern* or *Form*? And dos he think this amounts to a Command that we shou'd in all ordinary cases use *Forms*, when there is not one tittle to that purpose in the H. Scriptures and Particularly in the *New Testament*; when there are no such *Forms* given us by God, nor the least *Direction* who shou'd compose 'em for us? If we shou'd allow him that the *Lords Prayer* is prescrib'd as a *Form* that must be constantly us'd in Private and Publick Worship (which he neither has, nor indeed can any man Prove) yet all that he cou'd infer thence, were, That we have a particular Command to use that *Form*; but it will by no means follow, that we have any such particular Command to use other *human prescribed Forms in all our ordinary Prayers.* So that to use *free prayer* in our ordinary Publick Worship dos not *displace any particular command, nor turn God's way out of his Worship to make room for our own.* For God has undoubtedly by this general precept oblig'd us to *free-prayer*, and has no way confin'd the use of it to extraordinary cases only, having no-way recommended any *sett form* to Christians, unless we take this comprehensive *patern* of Christ's to be *One*, and if we do, that's the *only one* he has enjoyn'd. So that I may more justly hence infer, That those *turn God's way out of his Worship*, who confine men in their publick Administrations to such *human sett-forms* as God has no where enjoyn'd the use of, by either *general* or *particular* precept, and are indeed in the Bp's sense only *human Inventions*; whereas those more exactly observe his *directions*, who use the only *form* which there is any appearance of his having prescrib'd to us Christians, but as to all other Prayers, use the freedom which God allows us when he enjoyns no other *Forms* but this.

IV. *It seems highly agreeable to the Wisdom of God, that the mode of praying with or without a form shou'd be left so far undetermin'd as to confine us to neither way by any particular precept.*

And therefore he has only given us general rules relating to this duty, and one comprehensive either *Pattern* or *Form*, but has left us in the particular exercises of this duty to the determination of

Christian Prudence, whether we shall use a *sett-form* or not. For there is no doubt, but that the ignorance and weakness of some may need such *crutches*, as *sett-forms*, especially when they pray with others; and therefore such helps are allow'd 'em. And yet more grown and improv'd Christians shou'd by their advancement in divine knowledge, by their frequent consideration of their own necessities, and by frequent exercise in this duty, endeavour to attain those Gifts that may sett 'em above the need of those helps, and enable 'em to express their own sentiments and desires in Prayer to God on all emergent occasions, without running to other mens *books* and *compositures* for that end. Especially Ministers shou'd be furnisht with such a Gift. And therefore God has not thought fit to hinder the exercise of, and improvement in such an excellent Gift, by prescribing to either *People* or *Ministers* a *stinted Liturgy* even in reference to the most *ordinary* occasions of Prayer.

V. *For what his Lp. adds about the peoples joyning with the Minister in repeating of publick Prayer, p.* 36, 37, 38, *&c.* I shall only subjoyn,

1. That 'tis not deny'd that the people expresst their joyning in the publick Prayers in Christian Assemblys by adding their *Amen* to 'em, as appears from 1 *Cor.* 14. 16. And if under the *Old Testament* they added to their *Amen*, *Hallelujah*, as 106 *Ps.* 48. or *He is good, for his mercy endures for ever*, 2 *Chron.* 7. 3. It makes no great difference in the matter.

2. Yet he has brought neither precept nor example from the *New Testament* of the peoples *Repeating the Prayer* together with the Minister.

For that passage, 4 *Acts* 24. proves no more than a consent of their minds (ὁμοθυμαδὸν) to that Prayer which was then offer'd up. (And the same might be said of his instance out of the *Old Testament*, 21 *Judges* 2.) And here the Bp. very gravely obtrudes upon us a wonderful conceit of that Assembly being inspir'd, not only to *think the same thing, but to utter the same words, p.* 37, for which there is no necessity from the words, nor indeed any great probability.

bility. For the inſtance of *Paul* and *Silas* it has leſs weight in it. They might *pray together*, tho one only ſpake, and yet both uſe their voices in *ſinging* together. And as the Bp. himſelf obſerves, It might be a *Pſalm* they ſung including both matter of *prayer* and *praiſe*. Nor will it follow, that becauſe they might ſing a *Pſalm-prayer*, that they might ſay a *proſe-prayer* together. And 'tis ſtrange that his Lp. ſhou'd produce the 6 *Rev.* 9, 10, *&c.* as an example of peoples joyning their voices in publick Prayer, becauſe we read there of the *ſouls of the Martyrs under the Altar crying with a loud voice, How long, O Lord, holy and true, &c.* For ſure he dos not take *crying with a loud voice* in a literal ſenſe, when ſpoken of departed ſouls that have none. If indeed he cou'd prove that thoſe ſouls had *atherial vehicles*, and in thoſe *vehicles* were furniſht with organs of ſpeech, this might be a notable argument to his purpoſe. But otherwiſe, That argument he uſes, *p.* 40. from the peoples ſaying *Amen* at the end of the Prayer, is better of the two, tho how it will prove their repeating the whole Prayer, I know not: any more than how the peoples joyning with the Miniſter in *ſinging* will prove their joyning in thoſe *Prayers* that require no ſuch uſe of their voice. For the *Angels* and *Elders*, 7 *Rev.* 11. I have ſhewn him his miſtake before. So that he is far from having brought any *clear proof* as he pretends, *p.* 40 to excuſe their practice herein from being *one* of his *own* ſort of *human Inventions*. And tho I am more charitable than to take this advantage to arraign it as unlawful, yet I muſt confeſs I am not very fond of it; becauſe it ſeems leſs ſutable to the gravity and ſolemnity of Chriſtian Worſhip, and brings in a confuſed noiſe in a Chriſtian Aſſembly, too like that of a *Dover court*, where 'tis ſaid *all ſpeak*, and *none hear*.

Having conſider'd the *Directions* of the *H. Scriptures* concerning this part of *Religious Worſhip*, I come to examin the *Application* his Lp. makes of 'em to the *principles* and *practice* of *Conformiſts* and *Diſſenters*. And,

First,

First, for the *Principles* of *Diſſenters*, I ſhall give a true Account of 'em, and then conſider that very ſtrange one his Lp. has offer'd.

I ſhall give a true Account of their Judgment as far as it can be taken, from their moſt judicious Writers on this ſubject, or the publick propoſals they have made in reference to theſe matters.

1. *They always carefully diſtinguiſh between the Gift, and the Grace or Spirit of Prayer.* By the *Grace* or *Spirit* of *Prayer*, they underſtand *thoſe inward holy deſires and devout affections, which the H. Spirit forms and excites in the minds of good men, and which are the life and ſoul of our external Prayers.* By the *Gift* of *Prayer* they underſtand, *An ability of chooſing ſutable matter of Prayer, and offering it up to God in expreſſions fit to repreſent our inward pious deſires and affections on all emergent occaſions.* This *Gift* they have always own'd to be ſeparable from the *Grace* of *Prayer*, Many that have the *one* being deſtitute of the *other*. So far are they from confounding theſe two diſtinct things, as the Bp. unhappily ſuppoſes 'em to do. This *Gift* of *Prayer* they ſuppoſe the effect of the divine bleſſing on our diligent ſtudy and meditation, and frequent exerciſe in this holy duty. As all other ordinary *Gifts* of the Spirit of God are. For they ſuppoſe the *Gift* of *Prayer* as well as that of *Preaching* capable of falling under Rules for its attainment and exerciſe, and do accordingly highly approve of thoſe which that Judicious Divine Bp. *Wilkins* has laid down in that excellent Diſcourſe he calls his *Gift of Prayer*. That there is ſuch a *Gift* his Lp. himſelf owns, *p.* 46. and *p.* 54. And I ſhall add under this Head, that there are very different degrees of this, as there are of all other *Abilities* and *Gifts*.

2. *They do indeed ſuppoſe that ordinarily all Miniſters ſhou'd be furniſht with a competent meaſure of the gift of prayer (as well as that of Preaching) in order to their due diſcharge of this duty on that variety of occaſions that occurs in their publick miniſtrations and private viſits.* For as no preſcribed Forms can poſſibly ſuit all ſuch occaſions, ſo to be incapable of aſſiſting the devotion of their people

people in 'em, is they think a miſerable defect in thoſe whoſe office it is to *give themſelves continually unto Prayer*, 6 *Acts*, *v.* 4. and who will but very lamely perform it without ſuch abilities. And therefore Bp. *Wilkins* juſtly cenſures the want of it in them as their great *fault and ſhame*. *

* *Gift of Prayer*, *p.* 13.

3. They do by no means ſuppoſe every good man to be endued with this *Gift*, much leſs with ſuch a meaſure of it, as will qualify him to perform that duty in his *Family* without the help of *Forms*. And therefore they often urge ſuch to the uſe of *Forms* in their Families as cannot without ſuch helps keep up that duty in 'em without the hazard of expoſing it to contempt. (Nor do they diſallow all uſe of *forms* in ſecret Prayer it ſelf; tho they think it no way adviſeable for Chriſtians to confine themſelves to 'em in their Cloſet-devotions, ſince they cannot do ſo without ſuppreſſing many deſires ſutable to their preſent condition; Nor can their want of words be a juſt reaſon for their limiting themſelves to ſuch *forms*, ſince they are not needful in ſecret Prayer. Our very groans and ſighs are a language our heavenly Father ſufficiently underſtands). But yet they do ſuppoſe the want of this *gift* to be a great defect, and judge ſuch a degree of it ordinarily attainable by continued diligence and exerciſe as is neceſſary to the ſuiting our Family-Prayers to our particular neceſſities, and therefore do urge thoſe under their care to endeavour after it. And they do ſuppoſe that the H. Spirit is ready to aſſiſt good men in ſuch endeavors, not only by exciting their devout affections, but by enlightning their minds to underſtand their ſpiritual neceſſities, by directing 'em in the matter of their Prayers, by bringing the promiſes of God to their remembrance, by ſtrengthening and elevating their natural faculties to more vigorous exerciſe, by quickning their indiſpoſed minds, and helping 'em againſt their manifold infirmities. And ſo much they think included in what the Apoſtle declares concerning the aſſiſtance of the H. Spirit in this duty, 8 *Rom.* 26. And herein they aſſert no more than the Reverend Bp. *Wilkins* has done before 'em, who not only affirms, That this *Gift*, if ſeriouſly endeavour'd after, may be *at-*

tain'd in some measure, by any one that has common capacity, p. 13, but speaks of such Christians as *satisfy themselves with their Book-prayer, and go no farther as remaining still in their Infancy*, p. 11. and recommends this *gift* even to private Christians from the *Excellency* of it, from its *suitableness* and *necessity* (as being part of our spiritual Armour, which 'tis as unbecoming a Christian to be defective in, as for a Souldier to be without skill in the use of Arms), from its special *advantages* and *fruits* (as enabling a man on all occasions to relate his condition, and suit his desires and expressions according to several emergencys), and from the *inconveniences* a man is expos'd to by the want of it, (when being surpriz'd with any sudden exigency or strait he knows not how to relate his condition, or bespeak God's assistance without having recourse to some prescribed Form, which perhaps has no proper reference to the particular occasion), p. 22, 23, 24. And I cannot better represent our judgment concerning these 2 different modes of Praying than in his excellent words. *What one saith of Counsel to be had from Books, may be fitly applied to this Prayer by Book. That 'tis commonly of it self something flat and dead, floating for the most part too much in generalitys, and not particular enough for each several occasion. There is not that life and vigour in it to engage the affections, as when it proceeds immediately from the soul it self, and is the natural expression of those particulars whereof we are most sensible. And if it be a fault not to strive and labour after this gift, much more is it to jeer and despise it by the name of* extempore-prayer and praying by the Spirit, *which expressions (as they are frequently us'd by some men by way of reproach) are for the most part the sign of a profane heart, and such as are altogether strangers from the power and comfort of this duty*, p. 12.

Thus far that learned and pious Bp. whose sentiments in this matter are, I perceive, very different from his Lp's.

4. *They are far from excluding premeditation in the exercise of this Gift of Prayer.*

On the contrary, they think it ordinarily necessary as to the *matter* of our Prayers; Nay, they do not exclude all premeditation

tion as to *words*, any farther than the tying our ſelves to a Form of 'em may ſhut out ſuch ſutable petitions as the Spirit of God may ſuggeſt to our minds in the ſervour of our Devotions, which did not occur to 'em in our previous meditation. And therefore they think the name of *extempore*, and much more that of *unpremeditated Prayers*, very unfit to expreſs thoſe which they offer up according to ſuch an *ability* and *gift*; For they ſuppoſe that ſuch as pray with others, eſpecially in publick Aſſemblys, ſhou'd prepare themſelves for it by conſidering before-hand the particular caſes and neceſſities of thoſe that joyn with 'em. And againſt ſuch Prayers I can find nothing in that Text he alledges, *When thou goeſt to the houſe of God, be not raſh with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be haſty to utter any thing before God; For God is in Heaven, and thou upon Earth, therefore let thy words be few*, 5 *Eccleſ.* 1, 2. For ſure his Lp. cannot think they enjoyn of Prayers by a preſcrib'd *Liturgy*; For if we pray ſo, there's no need of this caution, that we ſhou'd not be *raſh with our mouth*, and that *our words be but few*, becauſe it will not lye in our power to enlarge or contract what we ſay, when we confine our ſelves to the words that others dictate to us. The Text dos indeed properly refer to private vows in the houſe of God, but may by parity of reaſon be ſuppos'd to forbid our Praying without due premeditation, and multiplying our expreſſions without any ſutable affections Which caution we account very neceſſary in all free-prayers, even in private, and much more in publick ones. So that this place affords a much ſtronger Argument for *Free-prayers* than againſt 'em.

5. *They do not condemn all Forms of Prayer either in private or publick as unlawful in themſelves.*

They recommend ſuch *Forms* to thoſe whoſe inability renders ſuch helps needful. Many of their practical writings propoſe ſuch *Forms* to the ignorant and weak. The *Weſtminſter-Aſſembly* expreſly recommend the uſe of the *La's-Prayer* as a *Form*. Nay, the N C Miniſters that treated with thoſe commiſſionated by *K. Charles* the 2d. at the *Savoy* propos'd a Reformed *Liturgy*, with ſome allowance of liberty to Miniſters for *free occaſional Prayer*, as a ground

of accommodation. Of which I shall have occasion to take more notice in what follows.

Having premis'd this just Account of the *Dissenters Principles*, I come

II. To examine those which his Lp. ascribes to 'em, *p.* 43, 44, *&c.* which I shall do in his own words, least I shou'd be thought to wrong him as notoriously as he has done his Brethren. Speaking concerning their way of Prayer.

" I shall endeavour (*saith he*) to represent it with all fairness " and impartiality, and leave you to judge as God shall direct you, " and as you'll answer it at the last day.

" 1. And here I find that some of your Writers are of opinion, *that the Spirit of Prayer is given to all the children of God in some measure, for enabling their hearts to conceive, and their tongues to express convenient desires to God*, and that therefore " Forms of Prayer are of no necessary use either in publick or " private, on the contrary that they stint the Spirit, and hinder " men from stirring up, or using that Gift that God has given " 'em.

" 2. Others of you go farther, and affirm that all Forms of " Prayer are unlawful to Christians, and that therefore 'tis a sin " to joyn in a Worship where they are us'd, or to be present at " it.

" 3. That the Minister is the mouth of the Congregation, and " and that he only is to speak publickly to God in behalf of the " people, and that they are not to joyn their voices but only their " hearts with him.

" Upon these Principles you forsake our Worship, *&c.* And " First, For that position of your Directory, *that the Spirit of Prayer is given to all the children of God in some measure, for enabling their hearts to conceive, and their tongues to express convenient desires to God*, I entreat you to consider, what pro- " mise or foundation it has in Scripture, *&c. and in the same p.* 45. " This Doctrine is a meer Invention of men, and the Worship " built on it a vanity in the sense of our Saviour, 7 *Mark* 7. *This*

Principle

" *Principle his Lp. largely endeavors to confute from p.* 45. *to p.* 53.
" *where he calls it the* great Principle of the Diſſenters Worſhip,
" *and tells the people,* Now, my friends, it lies upon your Teach-
" ers who are of this perſuaſion, to produce plain Scripture for
" your Principles, or elſe to confeſs, *&c. Again, p.* 62. *he falls ſe-*
" *verely on this poor* Principle.

Anſw. I am afraid I ſhall much ſurprize his Lp. when I tell him that I can find no ſuch *Principle*, nor indeed any thing like it either in ſenſe or ſound in the whole *Directory*. I wou'd therefore entreat him to read it over once more, that he may oblige me with the account of the page where it lies; And I may the more reaſonably requeſt this favour of him, becauſe he has put me to the trouble of reading it twice or thrice over on this occaſion to no purpoſe. And I ſuppoſe the Reverend Compilers of the *Directory* gave him no commiſſion to coyn *principles* for 'em meerly that he might have the ſatisfaction of confuting 'em. But I'll do him the Juſtice he has not done them, by acquainting the Reader, that upon a ſtrict enquiry, I ſuppoſe his Lp. has miſtaken ſome *directions* of a *General Aſſembly* in *Scotland* concerning *ſecret and Family-Worſhip, &c.* printed there, *A. D.* 1647. for the *Directory* of *publick Worſhip* publiſht by the *Aſſembly of Divines* at *Weſtminſter*, *A. D.* 1644. And if I be in the right in this conjecture, I muſt add, that I cou'd very eaſily forgive him this miſtake, if he had us'd any ſincerity in repreſenting the judgment of that grave and pious *Synod*. But if it appear that he has obtruded upon 'em an Opinion which they no way aſſert, nay which the paſſage from whence he draws it is rather inconſiſtent with, then the beſt Apology he can make for himſelf, is to own his miſtake, and to make 'em ſome reparation for ſo groſs an abuſe. And whether this be not the true Account of the matter, I leave the Reader to judge, when he compares the words of the *Aſſembly* with the *Opinion* the Bp. aſcribes to 'em.

In the fore-mentioned *directions* of that *Aſſembly* concerning *ſecret* and *Family-Worſhip, p.* 9. *Direct.* 9. are theſe words,

" So many as can conceive Prayer, ought to make uſe of that " Gift of God, Albeit theſe who are rude and weaker may begin " at a ſett Form of Prayer, but ſo as they be not ſluggiſh in ſtir- " ring up in themſelves (according to their daily neceſſities) the " Spirit of Prayer, which is given to all the children of God in " ſome meaſure; To which effect they ought to be more fervent " and frequent in ſecret Prayer to God, for enabling their hearts " to conceive, and their tongues to expreſs convenient deſires for " their Family.

Now if theſe be the words his Lp. refers to, I wou'd deſire him to conſider a little better, how he can deduce this *principle* out of 'em, *viz. That the Spirit of Prayer is given to all the children of God in ſome meaſure, for enabling their hearts to conceive, and their tongues to expreſs convenient deſires to God, and as his Lp. adds, p. 53. without a Form.* For the Bp. hereby ſuppoſes that this Aſſembly thought that the *Spirit* of Prayer was the *Gift* of Prayer, and that this *Gift* was in ſome meaſure given to all the children of God, to enable 'em to pray *without a Form.* And therefore what the *Aſſembly* calls *ſtirring up in themſelves the Spirit of Prayer*, he explains by *ſtirring up the Gift*, *p.* 44. And accordingly his arguments againſt 'em, all run on this ſuppoſition, that they oppoſe praying by the *Spirit* to praying by a *Form*, and imagin the *Spirit* and *Gift* of Prayer to be the ſame thing, and accordingly he makes *decency of expreſſion a part of the Spirit of Prayer*, *p.* 46.

Now what can be more oppoſite to the words and ſcope of that *Aſſembly*? Do they not diſtinguiſh Chriſtians into 2 ſorts ſuch as are more *judicious* and *ſtrong*, and ſuch as are more *rude* and *weak*? Is it not the *former* whom they ſuppoſe to have the *gift* of *conceiving Prayer*? And do they not ſuppoſe the *latter* to be at preſent deſtitute of that *gift*, and (as Bp. *Wilkins* expreſſes it) to *need Forms as impotent people do crutches?* they do indeed ſay the *ſpirit of prayer*, (*i. e.* a devout and praying diſpoſition) is given in ſome meaſure to all the children of God. But they do not ſuppoſe therefore that all who have the *ſpirit of prayer* have the *gift* alſo, but the quite contrary. All that their words can be reaſonably extended

extended to import, is, That whereas there are manifold daily neceſſities of Chriſtian Families which preſcribed Forms cannot ſuit, 'tis a great infelicity to be unable to expreſs our deſires to God in thoſe caſes; And therefore ſuch as labour under that impotency, ſhou'd be earneſt to beg of God ſuch an ability and gift, ſo far as 'tis neceſſary for their due diſcharge of this duty to the edification and comfort of their Familys; that they ought in order to the attainment of it to cheriſh the ſpirit of Prayer, *i.e.* thoſe devout deſires and affections which the ſpirit of God communicates in ſome meaſure to all his children, according to their various neceſſities, and which cannot but be greatly hindred and dampt when our inability confines us wholly to the uſe of Forms, which cannot ſuit the particular condition of our ſelves and Families. And they ſuppoſe that ſuch an ability to pray ſutably to our particular neceſſities, is one of the ordinary gifts of the H. Spirit, which private Chriſtians ſhou'd beg of God, and have encouragement to hope for (ſo far as 'tis neceſſary to their complyance with his general commands of *making known their requeſts to him in every thing*) in the diligent uſe of ſuch helps as they are furniſht with, and frequent exerciſing themſelves in this excellent duty. Their words alſo do imply, that the more we grow in a devout and praying diſpoſition, the more eaſily may we attain ſome meaſure of that Gift, ſince *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaks*, and the more we feel our own ſpiritual neceſſities, the more eaſily dos the pinching ſenſe of 'em ſupply us with expreſſions and arguments in pleading with God for relief of 'em. And as this is all that can be drawn from their words without offering violence to 'em, ſo 'tis no more than (as I have ſhewn him) Bp. *Wilkins* aſſerts, and if his Lp. have any thing to object againſt any of theſe Aſſertions which are genuinely deduc'd from their words, I ſhall be very glad to hear it; But for the *Poſition* he aſcribes to that *Aſſembly* as laid down and expounded by him, 'tis his *own*, and not *theirs*; And therefore 'tis he is concern'd to prove it, and ſeems not to deal ſo ingenuouſly as he ſhou'd, in inſulting ſo ſcornfully over his own *man of ſtraw*. For all his grave

Reaſon-

Reaſonings concern no avowed *Principle* of the *Diſſenters*, and his diſcourſe (from *p.* 46. to *p.* 57.) on this head, is ſo far from being *grateful and inſtructive to the Readers of all ſorts*, (as he imagins, *p.* 49.) that it rather nauſeates all judicious Readers to find his Lp. when he pretends to explain theſe matters, and ſet 'em in ſo clear a light, ſo miſerably confound thoſe 2 things, the *Spirit* and *Gift* of *Prayer*, which all accurate Writers on both ſides ſo carefully diſtinguiſh, and muſt neceſſarily do ſo, unleſs they have a mind to fight with ſhadows, and contend in the dark without underſtanding one another. And therefore becauſe he may deſpiſe our Inſtructions, I wou'd deſire his Lp. before he writes any more on this ſubject, to read the 3 firſt Chapters of Bp. *Wilkins Gift* of *Prayer*, which he will find wrote with admirable judgment, and much more *grateful* and *Inſtructive* than thoſe crude and indigeſted Notions he has here offer'd.

There are ſeveral paſſages in what he ſaith on this pretended Principle of the *Diſſenters*, which I have elſewhere taken notice of, and ſhall only add, that whereas, *p.* 45. he tells us, *There is no Command in Scripture requiring us to worſhip or pray to God in a conceiv'd extemporary or unpremeditated Form, or ſo much as an example in a ſettl'd ordinary Congregation, where it was practis'd*, I hope I have already ſaid enough to ſatisfy an unprejudic'd Reader, that God's commands, in reference to Prayer, do certainly enjoyn free prayer, that there is not the leaſt command to pray in general by ſett Forms, that there is no command for the uſe of any particular Form, unleſs the *Lord's-Prayer*, which yet is but doubtful; And that there are more examples of *free prayer* in Scripture, than of *Prayer* by *preſcrib'd Forms*; That there is not the leaſt evidence of any *preſcribed Liturgy* us'd in the Apoſtles time, or in the 2 or 3 ſucceeding ages, and conſequently there is great reaſon to conclude they us'd *free prayer*, or pray'd in the exerciſe of their abilities and gifts; ſo that we have far more probable grounds to conclude preſcrib'd *Liturgies* of human compoſure deſtitute of ſcriptural *precept* and *example*; And if his Lp. will on that account cenſure 'em as an *human Invention*, and a piece of vain Worſhip, he may uſe his

his liberty. For I ſhall ſatisfy my ſelf with defending our *own* practice without ſuch harſh Reflections of that of *others.*

P. 50. His Lp. aſſerts without the leaſt proof, *That Moſes, David, and our Saviour us'd Forms of Prayer.* For the Inſtance that relates to our Saviour, it has been already conſider'd.

So when, *p.* 52. he ſhou'd prove that *H. men in Scripture reduc'd their Prayers into Forms before they offer'd 'em up in the Congregation,* he dos not produce one inſtance relating to *Prayer* in *proſe,* about which the only diſpute lies, much leſs dos he produce any inſtance of their uſing *Forms* of ſuch *Prayers* compos'd by *other men,* and thoſe uninſpired perſons too.

His Lp. having examin'd this firſt Principle he charges the *Diſſenters* with, proceeds to the

Second, *That all Forms of Prayer are unlawful to Chriſtians, and that 'tis a ſin to joyn in a Worſhip where they are us'd, or ſo much as to be preſent at it.*

And this *Principle* his Lp. takes the pains to confute, from *p.* 57. to *p.* 65. I do indeed perceive that he was better advis'd than to quote any Writer among the *Diſſenters* for this ſtrange opinion. But ſince in his laborious confutation of it he all along ſuppoſes ſome conſiderable part of the *Diſſenters* to be maintainers of it, I muſt freely tell his Lp, that unleſs he can produce ſome one Author at leaſt that has aſſerted any ſuch *Principle,* I muſt make bold to charge the breach of the *9th* Command upon him, and hope he'll either produce us ſome teſtimonies of ſuch as avow and maintain it, or do us the juſtice of retracting ſo groſs a calumny. For my own part, I never yet met with any one perſon amongſt either their Miniſters or their people, that ever entertain'd ſo wild and unreaſonable an Opinion. Nor indeed can they entertain it without plainly condemning their own continual practice.

Dos he not know that the *Diſſenters* call'd *Congregational* as well as thoſe call'd *Presbyterian* do every meeting diſmiſs the people with a Form of Prayer, I *mean* the *Apoſtolical* Bleſſing, *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Love of God, and the Communion of the H. Spirit be with you all, Amen,* 2 *Cor.* 13. *v.* 14. And can he deny

this to be a Form of Prayer, when the solemn *Blessing* among the Jews *6 Numb.* 23. which *Aaron* and his Sons were order'd to pronounce, is one of his Lordship's chief instances of a prescribed *Form* of Prayer? So that if there be any *Dissenters* of the Opinion his Lordship attributes to 'em, they shou'd renounce Communion with their own Churches, and much more with the *Dutch* and *French* Churches, among whom larger Forms are frequently us'd, which he knows they are far from doing, whatever others may have done, who so uncharitably unchurch 'em for want of Prelatical Ordination. I have already told him that the *Directory* recommends the *Lord's Prayer* as a *Form*, and such Forms of Prayer were drawn up for publick use by the NC Divines at the *Savoy* in their Proposals for Accommodation, (and indeed the most unexceptionable ones I have yet seen, as consisting almost entirely of scriptural expressions); Nay even those who are most severe in condemning stinted *Liturgys*, do it not, because they think Forms of Prayer unlawful, but because they look on the confining all publick Prayers to such *prescribed Forms*, as a pernicious Engine to exclude the exercise of that *Ability* or *Gift* with which all duly qualifi'd Ministers are endu'd for Prayer as well as Preaching, nay to exclude many occasional requests which such sett Forms cou'd make no particular provision for. So that the whole of what he has said from *p.* 57. to *p.* 65. dos no more concern the *Dissenters* than himself, and 'tis easy for his Lp. to triumph when he meets with no Adversary.

And yet there are some things in his confutation of this pretended Principle very liable to exception. As to instance in two.

1. Since it appears by the foregoing Remarks that God has no more commanded our Praying with a Form than without one, he shou'd, if he had been impartial, have represented the contrary Opinion of the *unlawfulness* of *free prayer*, to be of altogether as dangerous consequence as that which he confutes, and he'll find that the best arguments he brings against the latter, are altogether as valid against the former. For that former Opinion wou'd have divided men from the Communion of the whole Church

in

in its first and purest Ages; And the forbidding *free-prayer* is attended with as many pernicious effects as the forbidding of *Forms*, and perhaps more, so that the Devil may have altogether as subtil and dangerous designs to drive on by seducing men to the *one* of these mistakes as to the *other*, Nay this Opinion of the *unlawfulness* of *free-prayer* may as much tend to flatter men with a good opinion of themselves, as if they discharg'd that duty sufficiently, when, like the *Papists*, they have run over their *Beads*; As the other Opinion can tempt men to think they are partakers of the *sanctifying influences* of the *H. Spirit*, because they partake of a *common Gift*; And I am sure the condemning *free-prayer* has a far more pernicious influence to hinder secret devotion. For in *free-prayer* a man needs not express his desires in words at all, and therefore need not forbear praying for want of a *Form*, whereas if he omit *free-prayer*, he must rarely ever suit that part of his devotions to his particular circumstances and condition.

2. As his Lp. has sufficiently wrong'd the *Dissenters* by falsly imputing such a *Principle* to 'em, so he has greatly added to the injury, by telling the world, *That on this account the pious custom of training up young people to a constant course of Devotion in their morning and evening secret prayers is too universally laid aside among the Dissenters, as he has found by experience, and for the truth of the observation, he saith he dare appeal to all of the Dissenters.*

Answ. What is it that a man who is grown remarkable for his Talent of *asserting boldly*, dare not venture on? But sure he cannot hope by meer confidence to persuade us out of our senses. And therefore since he appeals to us in this matter, we must needs tell him, We take what he asserts to be contrary to undoubted matter of Fact; For we know of no Protestants in the world that more universally urge all in their Families to constant secret prayer than the *Dissenters*; And we cou'd wish there were (proportionably to the numbers on each side) one of their Communion for five or ten of the *Dissenters* that maintain daily Family-prayer. I know comparisons are odious, and therefore shou'd never have made this, if his Lp's gross partiality had not extorted it, who in

this

this charge has ſeem'd to lay aſide all regard to truth, or indeed to any appearance and ſhew of it. It were very deſirable that ſome of our *Convocations* wou'd take as effectual a courſe to promote *ſecret*, and *Family-devotion* as that *General Aſſembly* in *Scotland*, (on whoſe words he wou'd have obtruded his firſt pretended Principle of the Diſſenters) who not only adviſe all particular perſons to prayer and meditation, but enjoyn *Paſtors to preſs it on all under their charge*, and *the Heads of Familys to have a care that both themſelves and all within their charge be daily diligent therein.* Directions, *&c. p.* 1. And I can hear of no Miniſters that ſo frequently urge this duty on their People as theirs. Nor do I know of any among the Diſſenters that ſcruple the teaching their children the *Lord's Prayer* or other ſhort *Forms*, tho they may perhaps take more pains than others to prevent their ſaying 'em by rote without underſtanding 'em. But I wonder much what his Lp. means when he tells us ſo gravely, *p.* 64. *As for children and ignorant people among thoſe of this perſuaſion, I am well aſſured, many of 'em never bow their knees in ſecret to God, and ſeveral of thoſe that are grown up are forc'd to ſpeak aloud, or cannot pray at all, which is againſt the nature of ſecret-prayer, and expoſes not only the perſon that uſes it to the cenſure of hypocriſy, but the duty to contempt.* I ſhall not now enquire how he is aſſur'd of what they do, or do not in ſecret; Nor need he ſure be told, that there are too many children and ignorant people in their Communion as well as that of the Diſſenters, that after all the pains taken to perſuade 'em to their duty, do yet neglect it; But ſure there is ſome ſtrange myſtery in what he aſſerts of thoſe that are grown up, if we cou'd but find it out. Dos his Lp. then imagin, that praying *without a Form* muſt neceſſarily diſpoſe a man to *ſpeak loud*, whereas if he pray'd by a Form, it wou'd oblige him to *whiſper* his devotions *ſoftly*? Or wou'd a conforming Lay-man that's unaccuſtom'd to ſecret Prayer, be leſs liable to this inconvenience of *bawling out*, becauſe he has his *Prayer-book* before him? Sure one wou'd think there's as little danger of this in *conceived prayer*, in which we need not form our deſires into words, or uſe our voice at all. But if his

Lp.

Lp. in this only deſign'd to tell us of the weakneſs that ſome indiſcreet perſons have run into, perhaps thro their zeal and earneſtneſs (tho ill-govern'd), but which their opinion or practice, as Diſſenters, has no influence on, Why dos he trouble the world with ſuch little impertinent ſtorys as ſignify nothing to the purpoſe, unleſs it be to expoſe his way of arguing to be ſmil'd at by the *children* and *ignorant people* themſelves? But what trifling things may not a wiſe man ſay when he pleads the Cauſe of a *Party* inſtead of that of *Truth*.

For his Lp's Third Principle of Diſſenters, *viz. That the Miniſter is the Mouth of the Congregation, and that the people have nothing to do but to joyn with him in their hearts.*

I ſhall only ſuggeſt concerning it, That 'tis true we think the *Miniſter* is the *Mouth of the Congregation*, and can find neither *precept* or *pattern* in Scripture for the Congregation's *repeating a whole prayer* together with the Miniſter, much leſs of their ſo dividing the words between 'em, as that the people rather make the Prayer, (as in moſt Petitions of the *Litany*); nor dos the paſſage he alledges from 15 *Rom.* 6. prove any ſuch thing; And therefore on his weak Principles we might condemn their practice in this point as unlawful; But we are far from being ſo raſh and forward in our blind cenſures as he groundleſly inſinuates, *p.* 66. Nor do we (as he here aſſerts) ſuppoſe that the people have nothing to do but to joyn in their hearts with the Miniſter, but ſuppoſe their adding their *Amen* a fit teſtimony of their aſſent to the publick Prayers they joyn in, and he may in the Morning-Exercises of the Diſſenting Miniſters Printed at *London* find a whole Sermon on that head, urging the people to pronounce their *Amen* more audibly than uſually they do.

Having examin'd his Lp's unjuſt Account of their *Principles*, I think it requiſite to add a few things relating to

Secondly, *Their general practice*; Concerning which I ſhall only ſuggeſt

1. Such as follow the *Directory*, tho they are not confin'd to the words there propos'd, yet look on 'em as the *patterns* to which the ordinary part of their Prayers shou'd be conform'd. And accordingly, The *Directory* dos require Ministers to pray to that effect; Nor dos it disallow the use of those very expressions, where the defectiveness of the Minister's Gifts, or his unpreparedness by meditation renders it most conducive to publick edification. So that neither are such Ministers left arbitrarily to choice as to the most stated and constant matters of Prayer, nor the people left wholly at uncertainty about 'em.

2. All Forms of Words in publick Worship are not disus'd by 'em.

They constantly use our Saviour's words, as *Matth.* 19. *I Baptize thee in the Name, &c.* in that *Ordinance.* So do they retain his own words in the delivering the *Bread* and the *Cup* in the *Lord's-Supper* (tho, by the way, our Service-Book has groundlessly alter'd and transform'd 'em into a Prayer, for which I hope his Lp. will censure the Compilers of it, as having preferr'd their own *Invention* before *Christ's Institution*). So when they give the *Blessing*, (which is a Prayer) they do it usually in some of the *Apostolical Forms* mention'd in the *New Testament.* Several of 'em use the *Lord's-Prayer* as a *Form*, according to the advice of the *Directory.* And for those that disuse it, 'tis because they either think it no Form suited to the Christian Church after Christ's Resurrection ~~and~~ Ascention, or else think it not intended as a *Form* but only a *Pattern*, because they never read afterwards in the *New Testament* of its being us'd as a Form. Nay perhaps some may be too much led to the disuse of it, in opposition to the contrary extreme of others, who place some peculiar merit or vertue in the repeating these words. And his Lp. seems to be one that has run into this extreme, not only by supposing us oblig'd to use these words whenever we pray, *p.* 32, 33. and making the use of 'em a Badge of our Christian Profession, *p.* 35. but by recommending the saying these words as the *way to obtain pardon for our infirmities in our other prayers*, *p.* 34. But I wonder who those are of whom his

his Lp. tells us that they publickly diſpute againſt this *Form*, becauſe of that Petition in it, *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes as we forgive them that treſpaſs againſt us*, *p.* 34. For I cou'd never hear of any ſuch publick *Diſputation* on that Subject, nor indeed of any Diſſenter that ever offer'd ſuch a fooliſh Objection; ſome of 'em perhaps may have cenſur'd thoſe as hypocritical in the uſe of this Petition, who are ſo far from forgiving their enemies, as to bear an irreconcilable temper towards their Friends and their Brethren.

3. The true Reaſon, why the Diſſenting Miniſters ſo generally diſuſe Forms of Prayer compos'd by others, is not, becauſe they judge all Forms of Prayer unlawful, but becauſe they think free-prayer gives 'em the advantage to ſuit this part of their Miniſtrations better to the Edification of their people.

And they are very much confirm'd in this Opinion, both by what they obſerve in the H. Scriptures, and by experience.

As to the *H Scriptures*, They not only find no ſuch ſtinted *Liturgys* preſcrib'd either by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, but no orders given to any *Paſtors* of the Church to compoſe 'em for others, much leſs any warrant to enjoyn the uſe of 'em. They think it therefore moſt probable, if not certain, that even ordinary Paſtors in the Apoſtles time, and in ſome Ages after us'd *free-prayer*, *i. e.* their publick Prayers as well as Sermons were the exerciſe of thoſe ordinary Gifts and Abilities with which they were furniſht for their miniſterial Office, and not a meer repetition or reading of *Forms* preſcribed to 'em by others. Nay, they think the confining Paſtors to ſuch preſcribed Forms, renders 'em incapable of complying with the general Rules of Scripture, that require us to ſuit our Prayers to all particular emergent occaſions, which the Biſhop himſelf owns cannot well be done without the uſe of *free* (or as he calls 'em) *extempore-prayers*, *p.* 54. They think it therefore every way the ſafeſt to come herein as near as poſſible to the practice of the Chriſtian Church in the Apoſtles time, and thoſe ſucceeding Ages wherein it retain'd moſt of its primitive purity.

Nor

Nor are they less strengthened in their judgment by *experience*, on which some stress may be justly laid when we are to determine the modes of Worship (left undetermin'd in Scripture) agreeably to the general Rules of Scripture, and especially that of *doing all to Edification*. Now the Dissenters observe, that where publick Forms have been impos'd, and the ministration of Pastors confin'd to 'em, It has been generally attended with ill effects both in reference to Ministers and people.

1. *In reference to Ministers.* For as in those Christian Countreys where Preaching has been disus'd, and Forms of Instruction and Exhortation (call'd *Homilys*, or *Sermons*) provided for the Clergy, they have by this use of 'em, sunk into general ignorance and sloth, and taken little pains to furnish themselves with abilities to instruct their people; So, where stinted *Liturgys* have been impos'd, the Clergy, by the constant use of 'em, generally so habituate themselves to these *Crutches*, that they are unable to go without 'em, and find themselves at a great loss, when they shou'd accommodate their publick or private prayers to that great variety of particular occasions wherein they shou'd be the mouth of their people in their addresses to God. Whereas the constant exercise of their abilities in publick *Prayer* as well as *Preaching* greatly improves 'em, and furnishes 'em for assisting their Flocks with their prayers in all those manifold necessities, in which prescribed Forms are no more pertinent to their case, than *general remedies* to *particular diseases*.

2. *In reference to the people.* For they generally observe them prone to grow more cold and unaffected under the continual use of such *forms*, and consequently in greater danger of turning that holy duty into a customary lifeless repetition of the words prescribed to 'em. And tho this be not in it self a necessary inevitable consequence of prescribed *forms*, because no doubt a well prepared mind may use such with true fervor of pious affection; yet considering the common temper of mankind, there is something in the constant use of the same words, that dos as naturally tend to dull our affections, as the constant use of the same Instrument and Tune

Tune is tedious to a musical Ear, whereas a suitable variety tends more to raise and elevate 'em. And tho perhaps some few very devout persons may avoid this inconvenience of constant publick Forms, yet it seems incurable in the generality of the people, whose case must be chiefly consider'd, when we consult their Edification in determining the particular modes of Worship.

I will not disown that there are some inconveniencys on the other side, which I shall propose with the same freedom, and offer my thoughts of 'em.

'Tis indeed true as the Bp. suggests, *p.* 41. that in a stinted *Liturgy* the *people are more exactly acquainted before-hand with the words of the Prayer they are to joyn in*, than when the Minister is left to the exercise of his own Abilities. But as this inconvenience relates rather to the words than the ordinary matter of our Prayers, so how little weight there is in the argument drawn thence against *free-prayer*, I refer the Reader to the excellent reply given to it by the fore-mentioned Bp. *Wilkins*, * *Whereas* (saith that pious Author) *'tis commonly objected by some, That they cannot so well joyn in an unknown Form* (*For so he calls free-prayer in respect of those that hear it*) *with which they are not before-hand acquainted; I answer, That's an inconsiderable Objection, and dos oppose all kind of Forms that are not publickly prescrib'd. As a man may in his judgment assent unto any divine Truth deliver'd in a Sermon which he never heard before, so may he joyn in his affections to a holy desire in a Prayer which he never heard before. If he who is the Mouth of the rest deliver thro imprudence what we cannot approve of, God dos not look upon it as our Prayer, if our desires do not say Amen to it.*

* *Gift of Prayer*, p. 12.

But the main inconvenience arises from the *danger of exposing the duty to contempt by unbeseeming expressions, which men of weak judgments often fall into*, Of which his Lp. gives us a hint, *p.* 56. and, (to give him his due) expresses himself with great modesty and truly Christian prudence on that occasion, where the weakness and indecencys of some might perhaps have given him some real advantage to expose 'em. But as to this I shall only suggest,

That I think ſuch as are incapable of uſing free-prayer without apparent hazard of rendring it contemptible by their indecent manner of performing it, ſhou'd no more be admitted to the Miniſterial Office, than thoſe that cannot Preach without the ſame danger. Or at leaſt, that where no better can be had, ſuch ſhou'd rather (according to the direction the *General Aſſembly* in *Scotland* fore-mention'd gives to Maſters of Familys) begin with ſome good *Forms*, till by ſtudy and exerciſe they are capable to do better.

Having ſaid thus much in reference to our *practice*, I ſhall only ſubjoyn as to that of the *Eſtabliſht Church*,

1. That for perſons uninſpir'd to compoſe Forms of Prayer, and impoſe the uſe of 'em upon others, is neither warranted by ſcriptural *precept* or *pattern*, and is in the Bp's ſenſe only an *human Invention*. But to confine all publick Prayers to ſuch preſcribed Forms, is inconſiſtent with the general Rules of the *H. Scriptures* relating to this duty.

2. That the *Reading* of publick Prayer, (I mean *Proſe* not *Pſalm-prayers*) has neither *precept* nor *example* in the Word of God, nor indeed in the practice of the *Primitive Church*, in which it was the common cuſtom to pray, either with their eyes ſhut or liſted up towards Heaven. And indeed this practice tends ſo much to dull the affections of thoſe that joyn in this duty, that 'tis great pitty that thoſe who for want of the *gift of prayer*, are obliged to uſe Forms, ſhou'd not at leaſt be furniſht with the *gift of memory* to repeat 'em without Book.

3. I think the Arguments us'd in the grand Debate at the *Savoy* againſt the frequent Repetitions in the *Litany*, and the ſhortneſs of the Collects as defects that needed being reform'd have never yet been well anſwer'd.

And now I ſhall conclude this Chapter, by taking a little notice of the wonderful *diſcovery* the Biſhop has made of that double *Artifice* or Trick the *Diſſenters* uſe, to make *Forms* of *Prayer* of their *own* paſs with the people for *extempore-ones*; The *one* by *compoſing ſeveral Forms, and committing 'em to memory, and then tranſpoſing the ſeveral parts of 'em*; The *other*, by *remembring the ſeveral*

ſeveral ways they have tried in their ſecret prayers to expreſs the ſame thing, p. 55, 56. As to which, I ſhall only obſerve, That the *Diſſenters* have ſome reaſon to take it unkindly that he ſhou'd expoſe their ſecrets to the world; But this is a piece of treachery that muſt always be expected from thoſe that *deſert* their own *Party*, and have no other way to ingratiate themſelves with their *new friends*. Only they wonder why he ſhou'd ſtrive to make two *ſecrets* of one; For they cannot clearly diſcern any greater difference between theſe two *methods*, than between two *different ways* of expreſſing the *ſame* thing. But to do right to his Lp's admirable Wit, what he has diſcover'd is yet ſo real a *ſecret* to all I have diſcourſt about it, that I cannot find one of 'em was acquainted with it before, and therefore we are all oblig'd to return him thanks for teaching us this *new and more dexterous Art of managing our Devotions.*

Remarks

Remarks on the Chapter concerning Hearing.

And First, for the Directions of the H. Scriptures about it, I shall only observe,

I. *THat I do fully agree with him in general, That the Word of God shou'd be Read in Christian as well as in Jewish Assemblys.*

There is no doubt it was so in the *Jewish Synagogues*, And 'tis highly reasonable to suppose that the Writings of the *New Testament* were design'd to be read in *Christian Churches* according to what the Bp. has quoted from 4 *Col.* 16. And there is no doubt they were so read in the Primitive Churches. Tho that other place which the Bp. cites, (wherein the Apostle *Paul* charges *Timothy* to give *Attendance to Reading as well as Exhortation and Doctrine*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 13.) will not afford any cogent argument to this purpose. Because *Reading* here as well as *Meditation*, *v.* 15. may be understood of those private subservient means which young *Timothy* was here advis'd to use for promoting his proficiency in divine knowledge, and furnishing him the better for the exercise of his Ministry in *Exhortation* and *Doctrine*. And this I take to be the more probable sense of the words.

II. *That Reading the Law, is in the Scriptures call'd Preaching of it, I do not find any solid proof for.*

For

For in the passage he alledges for this purpose, 15 *Acts* 21. *Moses in old time has in every City them that Preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day*) *Preaching* may be there justly understood of those *Expositions* of the *Law*, and *Applications* of it, which were usual, and are elsewhere observ'd by the Bp. from 13 *Acts* 14. *p.* 75. And of such *Exposition* and *Application* 'tis most reasonable to understand that noted place 8 *Neh.* 8. where 'tis said, *They read in the Book in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caus'd 'em to understand the Reading.* And the Bp. dos not expressly determine whether *giving the sense* must be understood of a *Grammatical* or a *Theological* Interpretation, *p.* 74. I hope he includes the latter; For indeed to suppose that those words meerly relate to translating the words of the Law out of the *Hebrew* into another Language, is to put a very jejune sense on 'em without the least necessity, and contrary to probable evidence from other places. and particularly from that fore-mention'd 13 *Acts* 14. To which I might add the testimony of *Philo*, who tells us (*apud Euseb. de Prepar. Evang. lib.* 8. *cap.* 2.) *that the Priests or one of the Elders was wont to read the Law, and then distinctly explain it.* But tho I wou'd not exclude a Grammatical Exposition of the words of the Law from being intended here, yet I see no reason why the Bp. shou'd hence recommend to us the *Reading the Original sometimes in publick Assemblys*, as he seems here to do, *p.* 74. unless he cou'd suppose two things; *First*, that the body of our people cou'd as easily come to understand *Hebrew* and *Greek*, as those Jewish Exiles might recover the knowledge of their mother-tongue; and *Secondly*, that the generality of Readers had the same Gift of Reading those Original Languages, as some in the Primitive Church had of speaking all others, *viz.* by Inspiration. For I am afraid otherwise many of 'em wou'd but go very untowardly about the performing such a Task as the Bp. wou'd here set 'em.

III. *There is yet less ground for that peculiar sense he has assign'd to Preaching in the New Testament.*

" He tells us in general, It signifies to declare or proclaim the " word of God as a Herald or Cryer proclaims the Laws and " Orders of a King. Hence (saith he) only those that proclaim'd " the Gospel to such as had not heard it before, or read the Old " Testament to the people, are said to Preach. *Preaching* is di- " stinguisht from *Teaching* and *Exhortation*; and 'tis observable " that in the whole *New Testament*, tho *Reading* the Scriptures is " call'd *Preaching*, yet *interpreting* 'em *applying* 'em, or *exhorting* " the people from 'em in a Christian Auditory, is never call'd by " that Name. *P.* 71. And again, *p.* 72. The Original words " which properly signify Preaching, are κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζω. " From all which it is manifest, that there are only two ways by " which the word of God is properly Preacht; The *first* is, when " 'tis declar'd to those that never heard it before; The *second* is, " when the very words of the Scripture are read publickly to the " people as a Cryer dos a Proclamation which he dos not word " himself, but reads it in the words in which 'tis deliver'd to " to him.

Answ. His Lp. wou'd do well to examin his *Criticisms* a little better before he assert 'em so confidently; For there is none of these new ones he here offers, but seem liable to very strong objections, which I shou'd be glad to hear his solution of.

For against his new Notion of the sense of the word *Preaching* in the New Testament, I wou'd propose this obvious one; The Apostle *Paul* in writing his Epistle to the *Romans* styles those to whom he directs it, *Belov'd of God* and *call'd to be Saints*, and Thanks God that *their Faith was spoken of throughout the whole world*, *v.* 7, 8. And yet he tells 'em that *he often purposed to come to 'em, but was let hitherto*, *v.* 13. and adds, *v.* 15. *So much as is in me I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also.* And here is the word εὐαγγελίσασθαι Let us then apply it to one of these two ways of *Preaching*, to which the Bp. has confin'd the sense of that word. It cannot be understood of *declaring the Gospell to those that never heard it before*, For he tells us, *Their Faith had been spoken of throughout the whole World*; So that the Gospel cou'd be

be no new tidings to 'em. He muſt then (if the Bp's *Criticiſm* be true) mean no more, than that he often purpos'd to ſee 'em, becauſe *as much as in him was, he was ready to read 'em ſome Chapters out of the Old Teſtament at* Rome *alſo*. Now if this were his main errand and buſineſs there, he need not have been ſo much concern'd about the matter. The diſappointment of his purpoſe cou'd be no great prejudice to 'em unleſs he ſuppos'd they had none among 'em able to read. Nor needed he ſpeak of his reading a Chapter as ſo difficult a thing, *which he was ready to do as much as in him lay.* 'Tis plain then the Apoſtle was a ſtranger to the Bp's notion of *Preaching*; for he thought inſtructing thoſe more fully in the doctrine of Chriſtianity who had already embrac'd it, might be fitly call'd by this name.

So when he tells us, *Preaching is diſtinguiſht from Teaching*, How hard is it to reconcile this with the following Texts. We read in the 28 *Acts*, *v.* 30, 31. That *Paul* abode two years at *Rome*, *preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching thoſe things which concern the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* So that the Bp. is very curious to diſtinguiſh thoſe two expreſſions which the Inſpired Hiſtorian plainly took for ſynonimous ones. So the ſame Writer gives us an account of the Apoſtle *Paul*'s Speech to the Elders at *Epheſus*, in which what he calls teaching 'em, 20 *Acts*, *v.* 20 he calls *teaching the Goſpel, and preaching the kingdom of God among 'em*, *v.* 25. And in both theſe places the word κηρύσσω is us'd, and in this latter a phraſe of the ſame import too with the other, *viz.* εὐαγγελίζω διαμαρτύρεσθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. But perhaps an argument drawn from intereſt may prevail above any other. The Apoſtle *Paul* tells us, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. *the Lord hath ordained that thoſe who preach the Goſpel ſhou'd live of the Goſpel.* This Text he knows is generally applyed by Expoſitors to prove a maintenance due to ordinary Miniſters. And Mr. *Mede* particularly by εὐαγγέλιον here, underſtands the reward of good tidings. But if ordinary Paſtors of the Church have no other way now left of *preaching the Goſpel*, but *reading the Scriptures* (as according to the Bp's notion they have not) I am afraid the people wou'd ſadly grudge 'em ſo large Revenues on the bare account

account of ſuch *Preaching*. But if he'll give the Apoſtle leave to explain his own meaning, he'll find that *preaching* is the ſame thing with *Teaching*, or inſtructing the people in the Chriſtian Doctrine; For 'tis ſo explain'd in thoſe two parallel places, 6 *Gal.* 6. *Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teaches in all good things.* And 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Let the Elders that rule well be accounted worthy of double honour, eſpecially them that labour in word and doctrine.* If theſe be parallel Texts, as Expoſitors have hitherto taken 'em to be; then to *teach*, *to labour in word and doctrine*, are the ſame thing as to *preach*. And by the way, if the reward of good tidings be due to thoſe that *preach the Goſpel*, and if *Readers* be now the only *Preachers* of it in a Chriſtian Kingdom (as the Bp's notion ſuppoſes) how come things to be ſo unequally manag'd, and ſo contrary to the Apoſtle's direction, that they get the leaſt ſhare of the *Reward* for it? Why are theſe true *laborious preachers* put off with ſo ſtingy an allowance, while thoſe Biſhops that in his ſenſe never *preach* at all, engroſs the double honour to themſelves, both the *Dignity* and the *Revenues* which belong to ſuch as *preach the Goſpel?* I ſhall only add the following Texts; I hope the Bp. will grant that our Saviour commiſſion'd his Apoſtles to *preach* when he ſent 'em to diſciple all Nations, 28 *Matth.* two laſt *ver.* And yet he enjoyns 'em to teach 'em all things he had commanded. And the Apoſtle *Paul* accordingly in the ſame verſe calls himſelf a *preacher* and a *teacher*, 2 *Tim* 1. 11. And theſe expreſſions are plainly us'd as equivalent ones, 5 *Acts* 42. And they ceaſed not to *teach* and *preach Jeſus Chriſt*. So 15 *Acts*, *v.* 35.

Again, he tells us, *That preaching is diſtinguiſht from exhortation.* Now I think we have no reaſon to imagin the Apoſtle *Paul* underſtood any ſuch diſtinction, when he exhorts *Timothy*, 2 *Tim* 4. 2. to *preach* the word (Κηρύξαι τὸν) *to be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*, to *reprove*, *rebuke*, *exhort with all long-ſuffering and doctrine*. For theſe latter expreſſions ſeem to explain the former. And I hope he will allow the Apoſtle *Peter* to have preacht, in the 2 *Acts* from the 14*th* to the 40*th ver.* And yet what he ſpoke is call'd an *Exhortation*, *v.* 40. Nay, to put the matter out

of

of doubt, 'tis ſaid of *John* the Baptiſt, 3 *Luke* 18. That many other things in his *Exhortation* he *preached* unto the people. Παρακαλῶν εὐαγγελίζετο.

Again he ſaith, *That interpreting the Scriptures, applying 'em, and exhorting the people from 'em in a Chriſtian Auditory, is never call'd Preaching.*

Now either thoſe many diſcourſes of the *Apoſtles* recorded in the *Acts* are not *Preaching*, or elſe quite contrary to the Bp's notion, *Preaching* was *interpreting the ſcriptures, applying 'em*, and *exhorting* the people from 'em. For I would fain know what elſe he can make of the Apoſtle *Peter's Sermon*, 2 *Acts*, from the 14th to the 40th. 3 *Acts*, from the 12th to the end. 4 *Acts*, from the 8th to the 20th. Of *Stephen's*, 7 *Acts*. Of the Apoſtle *Peter's*, 10 *Acts*, from the 34th to the 44th. Of the Apoſtle *Paul's*, 13 *Acts*, in which ſingle inſtance, the Bp. will find almoſt all his Notions overthrown together. For, *v.* 15. After the reading the Law and Prophets, the Rulers of the *Synagogue* ſend to *Paul* and his company this Meſſage, *Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of Exhortation for the people, ſay on.* The Apoſtle addreſſes himſelf to comply with their propoſal. And accordingly his diſcourſe contains an *Explication* of ſeveral paſſages out of the *Old Teſtament* relating to the promiſed ſeed of *Abraham*, an *application* of 'em to our Bleſſed *Saviour*, and an *exhortation* to 'em from thence to believe in him, and not deſpiſe and reject him. And this very diſcourſe the Apoſtle calls *declaring glad tidings*, (or *preaching*, for the word is εὐαγγελιζόμεθα) *v.* 32. If the Bp. object this diſcourſe was not in a *Chriſtian Auditory*, 'tis eaſily anſwer'd, What can the difference of the *Auditory* ſignify to alter the nature of the diſcourſe, As if the very ſame diſcourſe in a *Synagogue* ſhou'd be *preaching*, but quite another thing in a *Chriſtian Church*. 'Tis plain here that the Apoſtle *preacht* when he *interpreted the Scriptures relating to Chriſt, applyed* 'em, and *exhorted* the people from 'em, ſo that theſe are the ſame thing. And if he ſtill pretend that ſuch *Expoſition* and *Application* had ſome other name given it when us'd in a *Chriſtian Auditory* than that of *preaching*; I ſhall, to remove this ſha-

dow of a pretence, farther add, I ſuppoſe he will not doubt, but the *Apoſtle Paul* either found, or at leaſt planted a *Chriſtian Church* at *Rome*, long before his two years expir'd, and yet he is all that time ſaid to *preach the kingdom of God among 'em.* So no doubt there was a *Chriſtian Chur.h* at *Epheſus*; and yet *Timothy* reſiding there, is exhorted to *preach the word, to be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon.* And in the place I firſt alledg'd, the *Apoſtle Paul* was deſirous to preach the Goſpel to thoſe at *Rome*, whoſe Faith was already ſo eminent, and ſo publickly known and celebrated. And indeed, tho the Goſpel be in the ſtricteſt ſenſe only news to thoſe that firſt hear it, yet it dos not ceaſe to be good tidings, or a joyful meſſage for being often repeated. So that ſince the Bp. has ſo ill hap in every one of his *Criticiſms*, I wou'd adviſe him to be more ſparing and deliberate in offering 'em to publick view; for his talent dos not ſeem to lye much that way.

IV. *The Scriptures have left it to human prudence to determine, What portion of 'em ſhall be read in our publick Aſſemblys, and in what order and method.*

To clear this, We muſt conſider there are two ways of Reading the Scriptures in order to the peoples inſtruction from 'em. As either

1. *When ſome conſiderable portion of 'em is read together. As ſome part of a Book or Epiſtle, a Pſalm, &c.* For the diviſion of the Scriptures into *chapter* and *verſe* are but a matter of late Invention.

2. *When ſeveral paſſages are read out of ſeveral Books, of the Old or New Teſtament, which are parallel to each other, and ſerve to explain the ſame Doctrine, or clear and enforce the ſame duty.*

And tho the phraſe of *Reading the Scriptures* be by common cuſtom appropriated to the former, yet if we will ſpeak ſtrictly, It dos as truly belong to the latter; and 'tis of this latter way of *Reading the Scriptures* for the people's inſtruction that we have the cleareſt warrant from the examples of the Apoſtles, and the accounts given us in the *New Teſtament* of the practice of the *Chriſtian Church.* Nor do thoſe baniſh either of theſe ways of read-

reading (either an entire portion, or ſeveral parallel Texts) that interpoſe an *explicatory* and *applicatory* Paraphraſe between the ſeveral parts that are read. Nor dos the Bp, that I can find, ſo much as pretend to produce any thing from Scripture againſt the intermixing ſuch a paraphraſe in our reading the Scriptures. Now if he conſult all the Sermons of the Apoſtles recorded in the *Acts*, he will find that they did read (or what is the ſame, did recite *verbatim*, and propoſe to the conſideration of the people) ſeveral paſſages of the word of God, all tending to illuſtrate and prove ſome *truth* or *duty* of the Chriſtian Religion. And their practice herein was conformable to that of our Bleſſed *Saviour*, who employd the firſt Chriſtian Sabbath, I mean the day of his Reſurrection, not in reading an entire portion of Scripture, but in expounding to the two Diſciples all thoſe paſſages in *Moſes* and the *Prophets* that related to himſelf and his *death, reſurrection and aſcention*, 24 *Luke*, 24 *Luke*, from the 13*th*. to the 28*th*. Nor do I find in that account given of the Worſhip of Chriſtian Churches, 1 *Cor*. 14 *chap*. any mention made of *Reading the Scriptures*, as a diſtinct thing from *Doctrine* and *Interpretation*; Sothat I know of no one *precept* or *example* in all the New Teſtament relating to the Chriſtian Church for this way of *reading*, unleſs what may be inferr'd from the 4 *Col*. 16. *And when this Epiſtle is read omong you, cauſe that it be read alſo in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewiſe read the Epiſtle from Laodicea*. But then we muſt not urge the Inference from theſe words too far, for I know of none that think themſelves oblig'd by it to *read a whole Epiſtle* at one time, tho no doubt it was fit the *Coloſſians* ſhou'd ſo read this Epiſtle then, as we ſhou'd be as forward to read a much longer that came newly to us from the ſame inſpired Pen. And yet becauſe reading an entire portion of Scripture was ſo conſtantly practis'd in the *Old Teſtament*, and the reaſon of it ſeems in part to extend to us, I do think 'tis very fit that that way of Reading ſhou'd be alſo retain'd in our publick Aſſemblys; tho how long an entire portion ſhall be ordinarily read, and in what order, muſt be determin'd by Chriſtian prudence according to the general Rules of Scripture.

V. *Tis*

V, *'Tis granted that the Word of God shou'd be read with great solemnity; but there is no particular posture prescrib'd in our hearing of it.*

For tho we read, 8 *Neh.* 5. that the people *stood at the opening the Book of the Law*, yet that posture seems there to refer to the Blessing we read of in the following *verse*. And tho we shou'd grant that the people *stood* here when the Law was read, yet they are elsewhere said to *sit*. Thus, 33 *Ezek.* 30, 31. when they came professedly to hear what *was the word that came forth from the Lord*, yet they are describ'd as *sitting before him as his people*. And those assembled in the *Synagogue* on the *Sabbath-day*, 13 *Acts*, 14, 15. are represented as using the same posture, as *sat down while the Law and Prophets were read*.

VI. *For explaining and applying the Scripture by way of Doctrine and Exhortation, It was a constant part of their Lord's-day worship in Christian Assemblys in the Apostles time.*

Doctrine is mention'd together with *breaking of Bread* and *Prayers*, as one branch of their stated devotions, 2 *Acts* 42. 1 *Cor.* 14 26. Nor do we read of one Christian Assembly that I remember on that day without it. And it appears by the testimony of the Ancients, that it was constantly practis'd in the first ages of Christianity (as the Bp. himself grants, *p.* 76) their *Sermons* being usually an *explication* and practical *improvement* of that portion of Scripture which had been read. Nor dos what the Bp. suggests, *p.* 75. render it probable that this was not constantly done in Christian Churches. For what he produces from 13 *Acts* 15. concerns the Jewish Synagogues, and even the argument drawn from thence is not cogent, for tho there had been constant provision for *Enlargement*, yet the Rulers of the Synagogue knowing that the Apostle and his followers pretended to some new Doctrine, might send that message to 'em. For what he saith from 12 *Rom.* 6, 7, *&c. That St.* Paul *supposes him who Teaches, and him whose office it was to exhort, distinct from him that ruled and ministred. And it dos not appear that every Church was furnisht with all these Officers*; I shall only answer, It dos not appear from this place,

place, that these four things requir'd four distinct Officers. We read only of two ordinary Officers in the Christian Church, *viz. Elders*, or *Bishops* and *Deacons*; See 1 *Tim.* 3. 1 *Tit.* 1 *Phil.* 1. 20 *Acts* 28. To the latter, *ministring to the poor* belong'd; To the former, *Teaching*, *Exhorting* and *Ruling*; and as these were several branches of the same Office, so probably since there were many such *Bishops* or *Elders* constituted in every particular Church, 14 *Acts* 23. 1 *Tit.* 5. Some might have their talents and abilities more suited to one part of their work, and others to another; and accordingly they might ordinarily divide their ministrations, and each attend what he was qualify'd for. And accordingly the Bp. well observes, that that the Apostle *Paul* conjoyns *Doctrine* & *Exhortation* in his charge to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim* 4. 13. And 'tis probable both are included in the Apostle *Peter*'s Exhortation to *Elders*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3.

Lastly, I do agree with him that there shou'd be such a summary of the principal doctrines of the Gospel as our Catechisms and Confessions of Faith usually contain; Which form of sound words shou'd be held fast; Tho that the *6 Heb.* 1, 2. contains that form mention'd, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. is but doubtful, and 'tis much more doubtful whether that *6 Heb.* 1, 2. contain'd six distinct principles or heads of doctrine; Of which, more afterwards.

Having consider'd the Directions of H. Scriptures in reference to Hearing, I shall now examine the Application the Bp. makes of 'em to the Practice of the Establisht Church, and that of the Dissenters

IN representing the practice of the *Dissenters*, he *promises to do it with the same Candor and Sincerity that he has hitherto endeavour'd to observe.* What sort of *Candor* and *Sincerity* that is, the Reader has already had a sufficient taste of, and he will find the Bp. dos not in this Chapter vary from the *Precedents* he had given in the former; For how little regard he has had to Truth, in the following Accusations, will appear upon a particular review of 'em.

" I. He charges the *Dissenting Ministers* with disregarding " Scripture-Rules and Example, and with laying aside all those " methods of Instruction the Scriptures recommend to us, except " it be that of Exposition and Exhortation. Insomuch (*saith he*) " that tho a man frequent your Meetings all his life, yet he has " no security, or hardly possibility, of learning from your publick " Teachings all the great mysteries of his Religion, or the neces- " sary principles of his Faith. For which he alledges these two " things for proof.

" 1. For

" 1. For first, your Teachers are entirely left to their choice " what place of Scripture they will explain, or what Subject they " will handle; And hence it happens that hardly any one man in " his life, ever goes thro the necessary Articles of Faith, or of Pra- " ctice in his publick Sermons: And for the truth of this, he ap- " peals to our selves.

" 2. You have no sumary of Principles enjoyn'd to be either " read or taught in your publick Assemblys.

Answ. There are some Accusations so gross and shameless, that 'tis hard for a man to treat 'em with decency, and to such Accusers we are often forc'd to apply the *Archangel*'s language, *Ep. Jude, v* 9. But our Author has that peculiar infelicity, that the more notorious untruths he delivers, he is still the more confident in 'em, and nothing will serve him, but appealing to those for the truth of what he says, who most certainly know it to be false. For with what face can the Bp. say, *That a man may frequent the Dissenters Meetings all his life-time, and yet have no security, or hardly possibility of learning from their publick Teachings all the great mysteries of his Religion, or Principles of his Faith, and appeal to our selves as witnesses, that hardly any one man in his life, ever goes thro the necessary Articles of Faith, or of Practice in his publick Sermons?* Dos he indeed hope to persuade the world, that the great mysteries and Principles of the Christian Religion (*Ex. gr.* the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation of Christ, his Offices as our Mediator, Faith in him, and Repentance towards God, or Regeneration and Conversion, the priviledges of all Believing Penitents, their Pardon and Justification, their Adoption and Right to the heavenly Inheritance, the office of the H. Spirit as our Sanctifier and Comforter, the necessity of his supernatural Aids, the different future states of the Righteous and the Wicked, the general Resurrection and final Judgment, *&c.*) are seldomer taught in their Pulpits than in those of the *Conformists?* Or that the *Dissenting Ministers* less frequently urge the great duties of Godliness, Righteousness, Sobriety, and a heavenly mind and life upon their Hearers? Dos he not know that the *Directory* requires that ordinarily

the

the Subject of the Minister's *Sermon* shall be some Text of Scripture holding forth some *Principle* or *Head of Religion?* Nay, dos he not know that the peculiar *mysteries* of the Christian Religion are so much more frequently incu'cated in the Sermons of *Dissenters*, as occasion'd some of 'em to reproach the *Conformists* with Preaching little but *morality*, and borrowing their Discourses rather from *Cicero* and *Seneca* than from the *Apostolical* Writings, and the *Conformists* to reproach them with turning all *Christianity* into *mysteries*, and Preaching *morality* too little? (I do not recite these criminations as approving 'em, for I abhor such general and blind censures, but as an evidence that matter of fact is in the general opinion of both sides contrary to the Bp's representation of it). Or dos he think it a good argument to prove that 'tis hardly possible for our people to learn the necessary Articles of their Faith from our publick Teachings, meerly becaus we are left to our choice as to the Subject we treat on? Can he find any scriptural *Rule* or *Example* prescribing to ordinary Teachers the exact order in which they shou'd explain the mysteries of Christian Religion to the People; and yet was it therefore hardly posible for the people in the first age to learn 'em all from their publick Teachings? As if ordinary judgment and prudence were not sufficient to direct every Minister in this part of his duty. And whereas he saith, that hardly any one man in his life ever goes thro the necessary Articles of Faith, or of Practice in his publick Sermons, and appeals to our selves herein, I must needs tell him, all the Ministers that I have discourst with, are amaz'd to think what shou'd tempt him to assert what all our Hearers know to be a groundless calumny.

And whereas he tells us, *That we have no summary of Principles enjoyn'd to be either read or taught in our publick Assemblys*, I might here enquire what *precept* or *example* he can produce from *Scripture*, requiring our *Reading* or *Teaching* such a *summary* in publick, distinct from the *H. Scriptures*. Nay, tho we shou'd grant him that the Apostle *Paul* intends such a *summary* by the *form of sound words* mention'd, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. yet how will he certainly prove that it

was

was to be publickly *read* and *taught* from *Timothy*'s being charg'd to *hold it faſt?* The 39 *Articles of Religion* the Bp. no doubt takes to be ſuch a *form of ſound words* that is to be *held faſt*, and yet they do not think it neceſſary to be publickly *read* and *taught*, any farther than the Doctrine of Miniſters ſhou'd be conformed to it. But if he intend hereby to accuſe the *Diſſenters* as careleſs of their peoples being inſtructed in ſuch a *ſummary* of the Principles of Religion, or (as we commonly ſpeak) of their being *catechiz'd*, I do not know any Miniſters in the world whom he can leſs juſtly accuſe in this matter. And perhaps the Miniſters of the *North* of *Ireland*, and thoſe in *Scotland*, do (ſpeaking generally) outſtrip all others that we know of in the Chriſtian world, as to their unwearied diligence in *catechizing* thoſe under their charge. And indeed the Bp's accuſations put me on the neceſſity of doing 'em juſtice in this point, by giving the *Reader* ſome account of their general practice. To that purpoſe I muſt premiſe, that they divide all the perſons in their *Pariſhes* grown up to years of diſcretion into *Communicants* and *examinable* perſons. For *Communicants*, they do not only ſtrictly examine them as to their knowledge when firſt admitted to the Lord's Table, but alſo perſonally viſit each of 'em once a year at leaſt, and particularly examin 'em as to their progreſs both in the knowledge and practice of Religion. For *examinable* perſons, they divide their *Pariſhes* into ſo many *diſtricts*, and accordingly for every *diſtrict* once a year, they publickly appoint the time and place when they intend to *catechize* 'em, and accordingly go thro the whole of the *Catechiſm* with 'em. Nay, they are ſo punctual and exact herein, that if any have been *abſent*, they publickly appoint another day for the *catechizing* 'em. So that there is not one of theſe perſons in their Congregations come to years of age, who is not once every year conſtantly inſtructed in the *principles* of the Chriſtian Religion, and perſonally examin'd about his knowledge of 'em. Now either the Bp. knows this matter of fact, or he dos not. *If he do not*, Why will he pretend to cenſure ſo confidently what he is ſo entirely ignorant of? *If he do*,

How can he excuſe himſelf in aſſerting, that there is no ſecurity, or hardly poſſibility of the *Diſſenters* learning from the publick Teachings of their Miniſters all the great myſteries of their Religion, or neceſſary Articles of their Faith, when thoſe very Miniſters among whom he reſides, take ſo effectual a method, that there is not one ſoul under their care, but if he learn 'em not, 'tis groſly his own fault, and cannot be imputed to the neglect of his Miniſter. And if the ſubtilty of this charge lye in the word *publick Teachings*, I ſhall only add, that theſe *catechizings* of the perſons contain'd in theſe ſeveral diſtricts are *publick Teachings*, and ſuch days are publickly appointed for 'em, on which the people can beſt convene for that end. And I cou'd wiſh his Lp. cou'd give us as ſatisfactory an account of the diligence of the Conforming Clergy in inſtructing all the particular perſons under their inſpection and charge. And I may add, that in the Meetings of *Diſſenters* here, and in *England*, 'tis the general practice to catechize publickly on the Lord's-days, and the Catechiſm is uſually gone thro once every Summer. And I am ſure our Catechiſm is a far more comprehenſive ſummary of the *Doctrins* and *Precepts* of the Chriſtian Religion than that us'd in the *Eſtabliſht Church*. So little reaſon reaſon has he to accuſe thoſe that rather ſet others a Copy worthy their imitation. And what his Lp ſaith of 'em, is ſo contrary to truth, that if their people be as willing to learn as they are diligent to teach, 'tis ſcarce poſſible that any of 'em ſhou'd be ignorant of the neceſſary Principles of their Faith.

For the *Aſſemblys Catechiſm* he has ſome exceptions againſt it, which I ſhall briefly conſider.

1. *It no ways* (ſaith he) *anſwers the deſign of a form of ſound words, which ſhou'd contain only the firſt and neceſſary Principles of the Oracles of God in ſuch words and method as may make it eaſily apprehended and attain'd by the weak and unlearned, which make up the bulk of the people.*

Anſw. How can the Bp. expect any *Reply* to ſo general a *charge*. I rather think the *Aſſemblys* Catechiſm is herein excellently ſuited to the various capacities of *Catechumens*. It has at the end, *the Creed*,

Creed, the *Lord's Prayer*, and *Ten Commandments* as the *ſummary* of our *Belief*, *deſires* and *practice*. And in thoſe, I hope his Lp. will grant the firſt and neceſſary principles of the Oracles of God are plainly laid down. And indeed the *Church-Catechiſm* contains little more. But for thoſe whoſe capacity is ſomething more improv'd, the Queſtions and Anſwers in that Catechiſm do excellently explain the three fore-mention'd *ſummarys* of our Religion, and lay down ſuch other Principles as are the moſt important and needful inferences from 'em. And why dos our Author imagin that no *form of ſound words* muſt comprehend more than what is to be firſt taught the loweſt ſort of *Catechumens*, when almoſt all the Reformed Churches do herein differ from him; few of whom compoſe Catechiſms for their people that are not rather longer than the ſhorter one compos'd by the *Aſſembly*.

And whereas he adds, *Our Catechiſm is full of hard words, ſchool-terms, and abſtruſe notions no wiſe neceſſary to be known, nor poſſible to be underſtood by children or unlearned perſons, for whoſe Edification principally a Catechiſm ought to be deſign'd*; I only add, If he had expected any Anſwer, he ſhou'd have been particular in his accuſation, and not left us to gheſs in the dark what inſtances he grounds it upon.

Again, *He accuſes it of being ſo long and intricate, that no one child in ten gets it by heart, nor one in* 500 *retains it, as he ſaith he has found by experience*; To which I ſhall only anſwer, that as we have little reaſon to believe the Bp. has ſo often tried this matter as to enable him to paſs ſo particular a judgment about it, ſo his experience and ours (who have better opportunity of trying it) do no way agree. For we know there is nothing in this particular computation that comes near to truth in matter of fact. And I believe if his Lp. make a more accurate trial, he will find as many of the *Diſſenters* children that have got their *Catechiſm* by heart, as of others that have done ſo by the *Church-Catechiſm*, even tho the former be ſo much larger. And if any of 'em forget it again, 'tis their own fault, not their Miniſter's, who more exactly examin 'em in that point, than any others that I know of. But

2. His

2. His severest charge against this *Catechism* is, *That notwithstanding its length, it is imperfect; some of the principles of the Apostle's Catechism being quite left out of it, I mean laying on of hands joyn'd with Baptism*, 6 Heb. 2. *A great defect sure in a Catechism to leave out a fundamental of Christianity.*

Answ. Is it not strange that the Bp. shou'd have no regard to the reputation of his own Church in such weak censures as these? Dos he mean that our *Catechism* has laid aside the expression of of *laying on of hands*, or the thing signify'd by it. If he mean only the expression, cou'd he not easily foresee that such an objection against the *Assemblys Catechism* has no weight in it?. Nay, that the *Church-Catechism* is liable to the same objection? I wou'd desire him to take the pains to read it over, and tell us where he can find *laying on of hands* mention'd in it. If he means the thing signify'd by *laying on of hands*, Why dos he not tell us what it is, but leave us to blind conjectures what this fundamental Principle is which he charges our *Catechism* as defective for the omission of? Dos he mean such *laying on of hands* on children as our Saviour us'd when he *bless't* 'em, 19 *Matth.* 13? Or *laying on of hands* on the sick when they were *heal'd*, 7 *Mark* 32? Or *Imposition of hands* on such as the Apostles *Baptiz'd* in order to the communicating the extraordinary gifts of the H. Spirit to 'em, 8 *Act* 17? Or *imposition of hands* in order to the setting persons apart to some sacred *Office* or *Charge*, 6 *Acts* 6? Or *imposition of hands* on the *Sacrifice*, 1 *Lev.* 4. 8 *Numb.* 12. 29 *Exod.* 15. 2 *Chron.* 19. *v.* 23? For Expositors mention all these various senses of the word in their comments on 6 *Heb.* 2. Now I wou'd entreat him to review 'em, and tell me which of these sorts of *imposition of hands* is spoken of in the *Church-Catechism.* (For I hope he dos not mistake the *Rubrick about Confirmation* for a part of it.) If none of 'em are mention'd in it for the Instruction of *Catechumens*, why shou'd he charge that as a great defect in our *Catechism* which is wanting in their own? But what if I shou'd tell him, 'tis highly probable that neither *Baptisms* nor *Imposition of hands* are mention'd in that fore-cited *summary* of Principles, 6 *Heb.* 2. as *distinct Principles* at all?

all? He knows Expositors observe that the Original may be read thus, *Not laying again the foundation of Repentance from dead works and Faith in God, being the Doctrine of Baptisms and Imposition of hands* (*i.e.* the *Doctrine* typify'd by those two rites in the Jewish Religion, their legal *Washings* or *Purifications*, and the *Imposition of hands on the head of the Sacrifice*). For as those legal *Purifications* were typical of *Repentance from dead works*, so that *Imposition of hands on the head of the Sacrifice* was typical of *Faith in God thro a Mediator and his attoning sacrifice.* Or we may take both these rites as typical of *Faith in God, thro the expiatory and cleansing vertue of the Mediator's Sacrifice.* And I shall suggest three things to strengthen this Exposition. First, that this Exposition is most agreeable to the scope of the Inspired Writer, who was about to treat of this *Sacrifice* of *Christ*, and its *expiatory vertue*, as the *Antitype* of the legal *Purifications* and *Sacrifices*, (as appears from the 9*th ch.* of that *Ep*). Secondly, because *Baptisms* in the plural number is never, that I know of in all the Scriptures, us'd concerning *Christian Baptism*, but is us'd in this very Ep. concerning the *Jewish Washings* or *Purifications*, 9 *Heb.* 10. Thirdly, because 'tis not easily conceivable how any of the other sorts of *Imposition of hands* shou'd come to be made here by the Inspired Writer, a *fundamental principle* of the Christian Religion. For why shou'd the Doctrine of *External Baptism* or that of *Imposition of hands* in any of the senses fore-mention'd, be any more rank't among *Fundamental Articles*, than the Doctrine of the *Lord's-Supper*, of which there is not the least mention made here? But since the Bp. seems to insinuate here as if he took the *Confirmation* practis'd in the *Establisht Church* to be one of the *Principles* mention'd, 6 *Heb.* 2. I wou'd very gladly, if he be of that Opinion, understand what grounds he has for it. For I am prone to suspect that the *Order* of the Church about *Confirmation*, is an *Abuse* that needs to be *reform'd.* Were there nothing more in it, than a grave Bishop's *praying over children*, and using this common Jewish custom as our Saviour did, of *laying his hands* on their heads while he prayd, I shou'd not much quarrel with it, tho why the

Pariſh-Miniſter's *Prayers* and *Bleſſing* (under whoſe Paſtoral care they are) ſhou'd not be as ſignificant, I know not. But I underſtand no good reaſon, why the *Biſhop* ſhou'd be order'd to ſay in the *Collect* us'd on this occaſion, *That he lays hands on 'em by the example of the H. Apoſtles, to certify 'em by this ſign, of God's favour and gracious goodneſs towards 'em.* For I take the Arguments which the learned *Daillé* has produc'd againſt his *Romiſh* Adverſaries, in his admirable *Diſcourſe about Confirmation*, to prove, *That the Apoſtles laid hands on the newly-baptiz'd only to communicate the extraordinary gifts, not the ordinary ſanctifying influences of the H. Spirit*, to be unanſwerable. How come our *Biſhops* then to *lay hands* on children after *their Example*, when they do not pretend to any ſuch power of communicating thoſe extraordinary gifts as the *Apoſtles* had? Nay, what divine warrant have they to *certify children by this ſign, of God's favour and gracious goodneſs towards 'em?* What promiſe can they produce of God's annexing his *favour* to this *ſign?* If they can produce ſuch a *promiſe*, here is a *New Sacrament* of divine Inſtitution in the Chriſtian Church beſides *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's-Supper.* If they can produce none, here ſeems to be a new *Human Sacrament.* For according to the definition of the Church-Catechiſm, *Here is an outward viſible ſign, viz.* The Impoſition of hands; *'Tis a ſign of ſpiritual grace,* no leſs than *God's favour and gracious goodneſs*; The *Sign* is made a *means of conferring it*, becauſe thoſe that uſe it, profeſs to *do it in imitation of the holy Apoſtles*, who did certainly by their *Impoſition of hands* communicate the holy Spirit; And 'tis expreſly made by the *Collect a pledge to aſſure 'em of it.*

Here wants nothing then but *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, which if it be not produc'd, here is in the proper ſenſe of the word, a *ſinful Invention of men* in the worſhip of God. And we ſhall have the greater reaſon to be jealous of it, if our Author advance the doctrine of it into an *Eſſential Article of our Religion.* However we may hence perceive that 'twas not in vain that the Church Catechiſm puts ſo wary an Anſwer into the childrens mouths

mouths when that Queſtion is propos'd, *How many Sacraments are there? Anſw. Two only as generally neceſſary to Salvation, viz. Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper.* But if *Confirmation* be a *Sacrament of divine Inſtitution* at all, I know not why it ſhou'd not be as neceſſary to Salvation as either of the other; If it be not, Why is it retain'd? I know indeed there is a ſort of *Confirmation* which thoſe excellent Divines Mr. *Haumer* and Mr. *Baxter* plead for, *i. e.* They wou'd have *adult* perſons oblig'd publickly to own their Conſent to the *Baptiſmal Covenant* in order to their *Admiſſion* to the *Lord's-Supper*, But then they wou'd have this done at ſuch years when they are capable of profeſſing an underſtanding, ſerious and credible conſent to it. But this can no way excuſe the common practice of the *Eſtabliſht Church* in admitting children to it as ſoon as they can ſay the *Creed*, the *Lord's-Prayer*, and *Ten Comandments*, tho no ſuch underſtanding conſent to their Baptiſmal Engagements can be expected from 'em. For this is no better than perverting a moſt uſeful practice (and agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture) into an empty Formality, or rather a ſolemn Trifling and Mockery.

Having

Having dispatch't the First, I come to consider the Bp's

II CHarge against the practice of *Dissenters* which I shall deliver in his own words, "But the most sad and deplorable defect of your performance of this duty, is your casting "out the Reading of the Word of God from most of your "publick Assemblys directly contrary to God's Institution and "Ordinance for the Instruction of his Church; Insomuch that "in many of your Meetings, setting aside a verse or two for a "Text or Quotation at the discretion of the Teacher, the voice "of God is never publickly heard among 'em. This is matter of "fact, and undeniable. And in all the Meetings of the North of "*Ireland* in a whole year, perhaps there is not so much Scripture read as in one day in our Church, by the strictest enquiry "I cou'd make, *&c.* Sure 'tis a sad thing that a man may go to "most Meetings many years, and never hear one entire Chapter read in 'em.

Answ: Tis really *deplorable*, that some men, when they write for a Party make so little conscience of Truth, as to offer the most barefac't untruths for undeniable matters of fact. And I am sorry that the Bp. shou'd be so unfortunate in his Enquirys, as to meet with no better Informers than such as have so grosly impos'd upon his credulity in the accounts they have given him of the practice of *Dissenters*. And therefore to ease him of these *sad* thoughs that he seems possest with on this occasion, I must relate matters of fact more truly to him, *viz.* That 'tis the general practice of the Ministers in the *North* of *Ireland*, for about three quarters of the year (For in most Meetings the Winter quarter is only excepted) to

to read every morning an entire portion of Scripture (usually a whole Chapter, or at least so much of one as they can go thro with in an Exposition of half an hours length). And upon the best enenquiry I can make, he will find very few Meetings, if any at all, that vary from this practice. What Apology then can he make not only for his charging 'em with *casting out the Reading of the Scriptures*, but for his telling us, *that perhaps there is not so much Scripture read in all the Meetings in the North of* Ireland *in a year, as in one day in the Establisht Church.* Let us suppose there are 40 Meetings in the *North* of *Ireland*, and let us suppose in each Meeting half a Chapter read every Ld's-day for three quarters of the year; (And this is the least that is really read, for they more commonly read a whole Chapter) yet by this computation there will be near 800 Chapters read in those Meetings in a year; And will his Lordship persuade us that there is as much read in one day in the Church? If he mean that there is as much read in one day in all the *Parish-Churches* in the *North*, there's nothing like Truth in his Assertion. If he mean there is as much read every day in each *Parish-Church* (as his words seem to import) what he asserts is so ridiculous, that one wou'd think, if he had no regard to truth, yet he shou'd have some to common sense, in his accusations. Nay, I must add, that I look upon his Lordship's charge as so unjust, that if we take the Scriptures to be read when-ever they are *verbatim* recited to the People, and compute all the parallel passages of Scripture that occur in their *Expositions*, and in their *Sermons* (in both which the N. C. Ministers in general, and particularly those in the *North* of *Ireland*, never us'd to be sparing in the use of their *Concordances*). I see little reason to doubt but there is as much of the Scriptures read, or as much of the inspired word of God propos'd for the Instruction of the people in each Meeting, as there is in each Parish-Church. And in the former 'tis always read with this advantage, that whatever is read, is expounded too, in order to the peoples being more fully instructed in it. And if this be a just account of matter of fact, I hope his Lordship will think himself oblig'd in honour and con-

ſcience to diſabuſe his Readers by retracting ſo groſs a ſlander as this, of our *caſting out the reading of the Scriptures, and juſtling the word of God out of our ſolemn Meetings*, ſo that *his voice is ſeldom publickly heard in 'em.*

For if there be any difference between us and the Eſtabliſht Church in this point, It lies in this, *Whether the Reading a larger entire Portion without any explication* (or, as he ſpeaks, without *cover* or *gloſs*) *or a ſhorter entire portion of it, with an explication chiefly drawn from parallel paſſages of Scripture, that give light to that which is read, be more conducive to the Inſtruction and Edification of the People?* And here the Diſſenters are ready to joyn iſſue with him. For as to this debate, we may juſtly appeal to all ſober and unprejudic'd perſons. 'Tis certain their way of *Reading* the Scriptures without any *Expoſition* of 'em, is far the *eaſieſt*; and he need not take any great pains to recommend it to the Clergy, who are not likely to be fond of this *human Invention* of lecturing on 'em. But if the other way of *reading* 'em (*viz.* with a brief explication) be not more inſtructive and edifying to the People, 'tis becauſe the Scriptures are beſt underſtood by the People without any help from their Teachers. And if ſo, why did our Saviour appoint any publick *Teachers* in his Church at all? If there be ſuch a *plainneſs in the Scriptures* as needs little explication to ordinary Hearers, If they *apply themſelves better than any man can do* (as his Lp. inſinuates when he ſeems to touch on this debate, *p.* 94.) Why ſhou'd ſuch Teachers undertake ſo needleſs a task? Why ſhou'd they ſpoyl the *plainneſs* and *efficacy* of the Scriptures with their uſeleſs endeavors to explain 'em to the underſtandings, and urge 'em on the Conſciences of their people? Nay, if the bare *Reading* the Scriptures be moſt edifying, meer *Readers* are far preferable to the beſt *Teachers*, and a good pair of *eyes* and *lungs* will enable the moſt ignorant *Curate* to contribute as much to the Inſtruction and Salvation of the People by the exerciſe of thoſe *natural Talents*, as the moſt judicious *Divine* can by his laborious endeavours to *explain* and *apply* the Scripture, and by the exerciſe of thoſe *gifts* which are the product of the Divine Bleſſing on his unwearied

unwearied ſtudy of thoſe ſacred Writings. And if his Lp. can perſuade us of the truth of this, we ſhall ſave a great deal of our money that we lay out in buying, and our pains in reading ſuch uſeleſs things as *Commentarys* on the Bible. But ſure when our Proteſtant Divines aſſert the Scriptures to be *plain in all things neceſſary to Salvation*, (as he tells us, *p.* 94.) they do not mean ſo *plain*, as to exclude our diligence in comparing one part of Scripture with anothor, or the help of Teachers to direct and aſſiſt us therein. Much leſs do they ſuppoſe their help unneceſſary to our growing in divine knowledge, and going on to perfection in it.

'Tis indeed true that there are ſome few Meetings (tho perhaps not five in this whole Kingdom) in which there is rarely any entire portion of Scripture read. And yet even theſe the Bp. dos unjuſtly charge with baniſhing the *Reading* of the word of God, ſince they retain that moſt uſeful way of *Reading* it, (*viz.* the Reading many parallel Texts that illuſtrate the ſame Truth or duty) of which we have the moſt frequent Examples in the New-Teſtament. And indeed there are few Sermons of Diſſenters in which there is not as much of the Scriptures recited to the People, as if put together, wou'd make up two or three Chapters. But I confeſs I take the omiſſion of this other way of Reading (*viz. an entire portion at once*) to be a defect which I wiſh reform'd in thoſe few. Nay, when the ſhortneſs of the days in the Winter-quarter leaves no room for *Expoſition*, I cou'd wiſh the *reading an entire portion* were ſtill more generally continued, as 'tis done in ſome Congregations; In that to which I belong, both are continued throughout the whole year. The Bp. may indeed juſtly charge us with falling ſhort of reading ſo much as the *Directory* recommends, but he will find it hard to prove that we fall ſhort of what any command of God to the Chriſtian Church obliges us to. And I do impartially think there are no Chriſtian Aſſemblys whatever, wherein more of the *voice of God in his Word is heard by the People*, and more unwearied diligence us'd to bring 'em to the underſtanding of what he has there reveal'd.

Since

Since then I have rectify'd his Lp's miſtake in matter of fact, I hope he may eaſily ſee how little we are concern'd in the reaſons he brings to condemn what he ſo falſly accuſes us of, *viz.* our general *caſting out the reading of the Scriptures*, or in the Anſwers he gives to ſuch *Excuſes* as he pretends are alledg'd to juſtify it.

He tells us indeed, that he has found ſuch pretences to juſtify it, but he was wiſer than to produce his Authors for 'em. As if the publick were concern'd in all the follys he can pick up in his converſation with ignorant people. And no wonder when he meets with ſo weak Opponents, that he can eaſily triumph over 'em, or rather that he can anſwer the Arguments he frames to himſelf. For as I have ſhew'd him, the generality of the Diſſenters need no apology for *not reading the Scripture*; whatever others may do for laying aſide the Expoſition of what is read, to whoſe conſideration I wou'd recommend the excellent words of St. *Auſtin* on 1 *Joh.* where ſpeaking of the Scripture, he ſaith, *Quare legitur ſi non libitur? aut quare auditur, ſi non exponitur?* and thoſe of *St. Bernard, Temp.* 55. *Non tradit mater parvulo nucem integram ſed frangit eam & nucleum porrigit.* But yet there are ſeveral paſſages in his diſcourſe on this Head, from *p.* 84 to *p.* 103. too groſs to paſs without ſome remark on 'em.

P. 85. He bids us, " Remember of whom 'tis ſaid, 7 *Mark* 6. " This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far " from me. While you thus juſtle out the word of God out of " your ſolemn Meeting to make room for your own Sermons, " I beſeech you to conſider whether this be not laying aſide the " Commandments of God for men's Inventions, unleſs you'll call " your Sermons (as ſome Quakers are ſaid to do) as much the word " of God as the Bible.

Anſw. Dos his Lp. indeed imagine, that a *ſermon* which chiefly conſiſts of ſeveral parallel paſſages of the word of God compar'd togther, and recited in that order as may illuſtrate or apply each other, *juſtles out the word of God?* Or dos a *Lecture*, which is an entire portion of Scripture, *read* and *explain'd*, juſtle it out? Is the word of God *excluded* by being *explain'd* and *applied* when

Psalms, and from which 'tis plainly distinguish'd. And this leads me to consider.

II. The *Prayses* the *New Testament* requires us to offer unto God by *Singing*.

And what was to be thus sung, we may learn from those 2 passages of the Ap. *Paul* cited by the Bishop, 5. *Eph.* 19. and 3 *Col.* 16. viz. *Psalms, Hymns and spiritual Songs*, or *Odes*. On which passages I wou'd make the following Remarks.

I do fully agree with the Bishop that this Passage of the Apostle's do's warrant our use of the *Psalms* of *David* in our publick *praises*, because 'tis highly probable the word *Psalms* refers to 'em. But then I must add, 'tis no less probable that the Apostle do's by *Hymns* and *spiritual songs* intend others besides those of H. *David*, especially such as contain matter of *praise* more entirely suited to the state of the christian Church under this clearer Light of the Gospel; As there are many solemn *thanksgivings* in many places of the *New Testament* easily capable of being turn'd into *Hymns* and *spiritual Odes* by being adapted to this use of singing 'em. And I see no reason to doubt but this passage do's as fully Warrant our composing and using such, as it dos the use of the *Psalms* of *David*. So that the want of 'em seems to be one defect in this part of Worship both among Conf's and N C's, tho some of the latter have of late reform'd it by the frequent use of *New Testament Hymns* in their Congregations, especially in the celebration of the *Lord's Supper*. There are indeed Anthems sometimes sung in the Cathedrals, but 'tis in a way wherein the body of the People cannot joyn with em.

2 But the *New Testament* recommends no other use of Psalms, *&c.* in the publick *Praises* of God, besides that of *Singing* 'em.

The use of 'em is no where enjoyn'd in the *New Testament*, but in those places forequoted 5 *Eph.* 19. and 3 *Col.* 16. and 5 *James* 13. and all those directions require the *Singing* 'em. That grace wherewith we must *make Melody to the Lord in our hearts* presupposes some *Melody* made with our *Voices* to which the other shou'd correspond.

And there ſeems to be this obvious Reaſon why *Singing* 'em is ſo expreſly there enjoyn'd, becauſe in that Religious duty thus order'd, Nature aſſiſts grace, and our delight in vocal harmony tends to elevate our affections more eaſily towards their bleſſed Object. So that we neither comply with the Apoſtles precept, nor indeed with the reaſon of it, by barely repeating or *ſaying* ſuch *Pſalms, Hymns* and *ſpiritual Songs* without *ſinging* 'em (except when we only read 'em for Inſtruction, without uſing 'em as Forms of Praiſe). Nor has the Bp. produc'd any example of ſuch *Pſalms* and *Hymns* being *ſaid*, as contra-diſtinguiſht from being *ſung*. For the 118 Pſ. 2. he dos well not to inſiſt on it to this purpoſe. For it no more proves our being requir'd to *ſay* Pſalms, as diſtinguiſht from *ſinging* 'em, than the word *ſaying* proves it, when applied to that *New Song* which is expreſly ſaid to be *ſung*, 5 *Rev* 9. He tells us indeed that we find in Scripture ſeveral ſacred *Hymns*, particularly of *Hannah*, the *B. Virgin*, *Zacharias*, & *Simeon*, and the Saints in Heaven, 7 *Rev.* 12. & 11. 17. *which are ſaid to have been ſaid by 'em reſpectively, and the circumſtances of the ſtory do not make it probable that they were ſung.* Anſw. 'Tis true indeed, we commonly call theſe paſſages *Hymns*, becauſe they are eaſily capable of being turn'd into *Hymns*. But we do ſo improperly, For 'tis certain the Scripture never gives 'em that Title, but appropriates it to what was *ſung*. What *Hannah* ſpake is call'd a *Prayer*, 1 *Sam.* 2. *v.* 1. That ſolemn Thanksgiving aſcrib'd to the Virgin *Mary*, has no Title given, (or if it was a Song, there is as much evidence of its being *ſung*, as of its being only *ſaid*). *Zacharias*'s *thanksgiving* is call'd *propheſying*, 1 *Luke* 67. *Simeon*'s is call'd *Bleſſing God*, ευλόγησεν (the word us'd for *Thanksgiving* 1 *Cor.* 14. 16.) The 7 *Rev.* 12. — and 11. 17. are plainly *Thanksgivings*. Since then the Bp. has not produc'd one Inſtance of *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, or *Spiritual Songs* that were *ſaid*, as diſtinguiſht from being *ſung*, 'tis evident this uſe of 'em in the praiſes of God is unſcriptural, and is far from having either precept or pattern in the Bible to warrant it; and if we judge of it by the Bp's own Principles, we muſt pronounce it unlawful: Nay, 'tis the more to be ſuſpected, becauſe

becauſe it croſſes the only direction given us about the uſe of 'em in this part of publick VVorſhip.

3. Since the New Teſtament requires our Praiſing God publickly by ſinging *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *ſpiritual Songs*, it dos fully warrant us to adapt the *Pſalms* of *David* to that uſe by turning 'em into *metre*.

For 'tis one great general Rule of Scripture, that all things in publick Worſhip *ſhou'd be done to Edification*, 1 *Cor.* 14. *v.* 26. 'Tis evidently moſt conducive to Edification, that the whole Congregation joyn in the praiſes of God by *ſinging Pſalms* (according to his Appointment in the places fore-mention'd). But this cannot be without turning 'em into *metre*, becauſe the generality of the people cannot ſing 'em in *proſe*, but muſt if they *ſing* 'em, have 'em accommodated to that uſe by ſuch *meaſures* as are familiar to 'em. And the addition of *Rhime* is but a convenient condeſcention herein to the weakneſs of the people, to whom *Verſe* without it is, thro cuſtom, become leſs grateful; (even as thoſe conſulted the help of our weak memories, who firſt divided the *Bible* into *Chapters* and *Verſes*). So that theſe circumſtances plainly fall under the determination of human prudence, and are accordingly determin'd very agreeably to that general Rule I cited before. And I may juſtly add, that the *Pſalms* thus tranſlated into *Metre* (provided the true ſenſe of the Inſpired Writer be deliver'd) are as truly the *Word of God*, as the *Pſalms* tranſlated into *proſe*; And we are as much oblig'd to turn the *Pſalms* into *metre* for this uſe of *ſinging* 'em, as to traſlate 'em out of Hebrew-*metre* into *proſe* for our *Reading* and *Inſtruction*. For they can no more ſerve the uſe of being generally *ſung* without the *one*, than that of being *read* for Inſtruction without the *other*.

4. 'Tis highly probable that the Pſalms of *David* were compos'd in *metre*, quite contrary to what the Bp. ſo frequently ſuggeſts, *p.* 5. 9. 21.

'Tis indeed true that we are now very unable to give an exact Account of it. And 'tis no wonder, when our knowledge of the Hebrew Language is ſo imperfect, and the diſtance of time ſo very

very great. But if we will credit thoſe who were more capable to judge of that matter, by having the advantage of us in both theſe reſpects, we muſt diſſent from his Lp's opinion in it. For that grave Hiſtorian *Joſephus* aſſures us, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 10. that *the Pſalms* were *wrote in various ſorts of metre*, of which he mentions two, ſome *Trimeters*, and ſome *Pentameters*. And indeed this is ſo plain of ſome of 'em, as particularly the 111*th* and 112*th*, that all Expoſitors take notice of the *meaſures* that plainly appear in 'em, and there can be no reaſonable doubt about it. Every verſe having in the beginning and middle 2 letters in order of the *Hebrew Alphabet*, only the 2 laſt have each 3 letters, tho the *meaſures* are even in them alike with the others. There is no leſs appearance of *metre* in the 119*th Pſalm*, as all *Critics* obſerve upon it. See the learned *Gataker*'s account of the ſeveral *Tunes* to which the Pſalms were ſuited, and the manner of ſinging 'em in his *Cinnus*. And if the Pſalms were compos'd in *metre*, that they might be *ſung*, 'Tis certainly moſt agreeable to the example of Scripture to turn 'em into *metre* for the ſame end and uſe.

III. For *Reſponſes*, There is no doubt that in ſuch places of Scripture as the Bp. has alledg'd, (7 *Rev.* from the 9*th* to the 13*th*. (The in the paraphraſing this Text, 7 *Rev.* 11, 12. his Lp. commits an odd miſtake in ſuppoſing the Angels and Elders to joyn in ſaying what we read, *v.* 12. whereas 'tis the Angels alone to whom that part belongs, tho they ſtood about the Throne, and about the Elders, and the 4 Beaſts. Καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἄγγελοι ἑστήκεσαν κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, *&c.*) 19 *Rev.* The inſtance of *Miriam*, The 24*th*. and 118*th* Pſ. and eſpecially in the Song of *Solomon*, which his Lp. ſeems to have forgot.) There is an Alluſion to dramatick writings. But 'tis obſervable that there is ſome difference in the *perſons* introduc'd as anſwering one another, and in the *matter* ſpoken, that requir'd this *alternate* way of ſinging. But I ſee nothing the Bp. has produc'd to make it probable that this way of *alternate* ſinging was the ordinary practice of the Chriſtian Church in the *New Teſtament*. He do's indeed alledg thoſe words of the Ap. *Paul* to that purpoſe, 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. For ye may all Propheſy one by one,

&c.

when 'tis *read*? Or do those less *honour the Word of God in their hearts*, who desire to hear it *expounded* and *applied*, then those that are content to have it *read* without any such additional *help* to understand it and profit by it? May we not as wisely tell our Author that he has *justled out this Text* by paraphrasing it, especially when he has done it so untowardly, and so little agreeably to the design of our Blessed Saviour? Nay how comes he here to call Sermons the *Inventions of Men*? Dos he think that God has not as expressly enjoyn'd *Teaching* and *Exhortation*, as *Reading the Scriptures* to Christian Pastors? Nay of the two more expressly, there being far more numerous and plain passages for the former then for the latter, as distinguisht from the former? How comes he then to make that a *human Invention* which he owns has scriptural Example to warrant it, *p.* 75. nay for which I have produc't him plain precepts too? Nay how comes he to assign us so wonderful a Reason, why we must own Sermons to be men's *Inventions*, viz. *that otherwise we must call e'm (as some Quakers are said to do) as much the word of God as the Bible*? Dos he indeed espouse that sottish Opinion of the *Quakers* who account every thing in the Worship of God a *human Invention* that is perform'd in the exercise of our own rational Faculties, and requires our Study and Meditation in the composure of it? If he do, I am afraid he must abandon the *Reading of the Scriptures* as an *human Invention* too, because that requires the use of our *Eyes*, and some small use of our *Understandings* too to read right? Nay he must on the same account call all the *Collects* in the Liturgy *human Inventions* (as the *Quakers* do) because he cannot pretend 'em to be as much divinely inspir'd as the *Prayers* recorded in the Bible. And dos he expect that we should regard such uncharitable censures as are founded on such wild and confus'd Notions as these are, any more than we do the senseless clamours of the *Quakers* themselves, who at least in this matter speak more consistently with themselves then his Lp. dos when he talks of *human Inventions*?

His Lp tells us, *p.* 88. *Many of our common People are strangers to the History of the Bible, and the first Principles of Christianity.*

Anſw. Either he means they are more ſo, in proportion to thoſe that are members of the *Eſtabliſh't Church*, or he dos not, If not to what purpoſe dos he upbraid the *Diſſenters* with it. If he dos, I wou'd deſire him to conſult his credit a little better then by obtruding ſo notorious untruths upon the world. 'Tis impoſſible to make exact Computations of this kind; But I doubt not, that if he takes a thouſand Families of each Communion, he will find that for *one* of the *Conforming Laity* that reads the Scripture dayly in their Families there are *ten* or *more* of the *Diſſenters*. I am credibly inform'd by ſuch as live in the North, that moſt Families of Diſſenters read the Scriptures dayly, and eſpecially on the Lord's day, both before they come to the publick worſhip and after; And 'tis partly on that account that the Miniſters lay down their Expoſitory Lectures in the depth of Winter. Whereas ſince comparatively ſo few Conforming Families have the Scriptures read in 'em, there may be perhaps the greater neceſſity for the reading a larger entire portion of 'em in the Pariſh Churches. I may ſay the ſame as to the other branch of the Accuſation, For the account given before of the care of their Miniſters to *catechize* every particular perſon in their Pariſhes renders it abſolutely incredible that their People ſhould be greater ſtrangers to the *firſt Principles of Chriſtianity* then others on whom no ſuch particular pains are beſtow'd.

The Bp. tells us, *p.* 95. "Reading a Verſe or two, and truſting to "the Miniſter's Application, without the Peopl's being acquainted "with the whole Body of Scripture, dos put Chriſtians too much "in the power of their Teachers, &c. This is the very Artifice "whereby the Romiſh Prieſts keep their People in Ignorance; And "your Teachers uſing the ſame method ſeems too like a deſign on "their Hearers, and tempts the World to ſuſpect that they are afraid "of the naked ſimplicity of the Scriptures, ſince they dare not truſt "the People with hearing 'em publickly read, except they add their "own gloſſes on 'em.

Anſw. Has his Lp. any juſt ground for this invidious Compariſon? Do the Romiſh *Prieſts* when they Preach put Bibles into their people's hands? Do they read it to 'em in their Mother Tongue? Do they

they urge their people to bring Bibles with them, and like the Noble *Beræans*, to examin all they deliver, and not to take things on truſt from their Teachers, without trying what they hear by that infallible Teſt? And yet he knows this is the *Diſſenters* practice, to whoſe Meetings moſt of their people bring Bibles, whereas few comparatively bring 'em to the publick Churches, unleſs it be that ſmall part of 'em which the Common-Prayer-Book contains. Nay, do not thoſe rather imitate the Romiſh Prieſts, who tho they *lock* not up the Scriptures in an *unknown Tongue*, yet never *open* 'em when they read 'em by a judicious *Expoſition*? Or dos he think bare *reading* the Scriptures, without ever comparing 'em, will beſt acquaint the People with the body of 'em? Or dos he think the People are in greateſt danger of being *ſeduc't*, when the Scriptures are *explain'd* as well as *read* to 'em, and that they are then likeſt to take up the right ſenſe of 'em when they have no Interpreter to guide 'em? Were the Apoſtles afraid of the *naked ſimplicity* of the Scriptures becauſe they took ſo much pains to add their own *gloſſes* on 'em? Or dos he think that meer *Readers* have done more to recover Chriſtianity to it's primitive ſimplicity and purity, and to reclaim the world from the deluſions of *Popery* then the moſt laborious *Expoſitors*? Why then do we not throw away all our *Commentaries* on the Bible? Why dare not his Lp. in this Diſcourſe truſt us with the *naked ſimplicity* of the Scriptures he quotes in it without adding his own *gloſſes* on 'em? Or will he own this for a juſt temptation to ſuſpect that *he has ſome deſign upon his Readers*?

For the *5th.* Excuſe, *p.* 96. viz. *That the Word of God, that dead Letter, is a dull formal thing, without ſpirit or life, where it is not applied, &c.* I wonder what *Diſſenter* ſuggeſted it to his Lordſhip; For 'tis a very *dull pretence*, and yet I do not ſee that the main thing he inſiſts on in his Anſwer dos vary much from the nature of the Objection. For not to inſiſt on his ſtill calling that a *human Invention*, which is undoubtedly of *Divine Appointment*, (and by his own Confeſſion has the warrant of Scriptural Example, *p.* 75,) If there be any thing to the purpoſe againſt the *Diſſenters* practice in his *3d.* and *4th. Conſideration*, it muſt be founded on this ſuppoſition,

That

That 'tis a great character of a Spiritual Man to love to hear the Scriptures read without any Expoſition or Application, but of a Carnal Man, to delight more in Scripture read and expounded too, then in the Scripture barely read. For ſo he applies that noted paſſage of the Apoſtle Paul, 1 Cor. 2. 13. And thence *He reproaches the Diſſenters as (notwithſtanding all their pretences to a more then ordinary ſpiritualneſs and reformation) little advanc't above the natural man that neither receives nor reliſhes the things of God, at leaſt not as they ought.*

Anſw. If any thing cou'd put us out of conceit with Expoſitions of the Scripture, it wou'd be ſuch ſcurvy and abuſive ones as this, which his Lp. here offers. And I do not believe there is any *Diſſenter* but wou'd delight in the peruſal of thoſe excellent *words* of the Apoſtle, while he nauſeates ſuch an inſipid *gloſs* on 'em. For muſt it not argue a ſtrange Confuſion in a man's Notions of things to ſuppoſe thoſe things ſo *oppoſite* and *inconſiſtent* that ſo admirably *accord* together? Dos the Biſhop think the ſtyle of the Scriptures is as familiar to ordinary Readers now, as it was to thoſe to whom the ſeveral parts of it were firſt immediately directed, or that there is no difficulty in the ordinary parts of it that renders a brief Interpretation highly uſeful to the Church? And do thoſe *love* or *reliſh* the Word of God leſs then others, who are not contented with the bare *reading* of it without deſiring all the help their Teachers can give 'em for their right underſtanding and applying it? Was it an Argument of a *carnal* mind in the *Queen* of *Candace's Treaſurer* that he was not ſatisfied with reading God's Word by the Prophet *Iſaiah*, without deſiring *Philip* to expound it, 8. *Acts* 27? Is it ſo *carnal* a practice in Miniſters to read *Commentators* on the Bible, or in the People to deſire to enjoy this fruit of their ſtudies and labours? Is it a *carnal* temper to be moſt *affected* with the Scriptures when we moſt clearly *diſcern* the true ſenſe of 'em; but on the contrary, a *ſpiritual* diſpoſition to *delight* in 'em moſt when we *underſtand* 'em leaſt? Or rather, dos not ſuch diſcourſe as this look too like a ſhrewd deſign to gratifie the *carnal* and *lazy* humour of the Clergy, by excuſing 'em from the pains they ſhould take in *ſtudying* the Scriptures in order to the ediſying their People by a judicious *interpretation* of 'em? As if our Author wou'd have

have e'm all transform'd into such as the 49*th. Canon* of the Church of *England* refers to, who, *tho Benefic'd yet being unlicens'd to Preach, are not to take on them to Expound in their own Cure or elsewhere any Scripture or matter of Doctrine,* and have no higher priviledge allow'd 'em, then *that they study to read aptly and plainly* (without *glozing* or *adding*) the *Homilies already set forth,* &c. (And by the way, I perceive the Compilers of those Canons were great Strangers to our Author's Notion of *Preaching*)

But after he has examin'd the pretences he feigns the *Dissenters* to make, (for 'tis evident they never brought any for not *Reading* the Scriptures) he ventures to give us what he himself takes to be the true Reason of their supposed Neglect of it, which he draws from 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. of which he gives us an admirable Interpretation. The Apostles words are, *For the time will come when they will not endure sound Doctrine, but after their own Lusts shall heap up to themselves Teachers having itching Ears.* " Now an itching Ear (saith the " Bp.) is one that loves novelty and variety. Because therefore " our Church gives the People little that is new in her prayers or " reading the Scriptures, but retains a Form of sound words in the " one and the plain word of God in the other: Hence it is that some " People cannot endure our service, but heap up to themselves Teach- " ers that instead of Prayers and Praises of God's immediate Appoint- " ment will gratify 'em every meeting with a new Prayer without " troubling 'em with such Prayers and Sermons as they think old " which are incomparably better; Only the itching Ears of the " People, as the Apostle foretold are pleased with the novelty and " variety of the one, and disgust the repetition of the other, as the " *Israelites* did that of Angels Food, 78 *Ps.* 25. 21 *Num.* 5.

Answ. If we be so fond of *Novelty* and *Variety* as the Bp. supposes, he has been very studious to gratify our humour in this new *Paraphrase*, of which I dare say no Expositor before him ever dream'd. For whereas the Apostle is plainly speaking of such as *cou'd not endure sound Doctrine,* and therefore sought out *Teachers* that wou'd gratify 'em with some new *Doctrines,* more grateful to their Lusts or Fancys, and entertain their *itching Ears* (as the Apostle explains himself in the

next verse:) *with Fables instead of Truth.* The Bp. dos with profound judgment apply it to those that desire to have the Scriptures clearly *explain'd* to their Understandings, and impartially *applied* to their Consciences. As if the Apostle had here quarrell'd with the People for desiring *Sermons*, when he had in the very verse before urg'd *Timothy* to *preach the word, To be instant in season and out of season, To reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and Doctrine.* And if we shou'd grant the Bp. for once (tho as I have shew'd him before there is no reason for it) that the Apostle by *preaching the word* understood *Reading* it, yet according to himself, *Rebuking, reproving* and *exhorting with all long suffering and doctrine* must imply an *Exposition* and *Application* of what was *read.* So that the Bp. has unhappily *expounded* and *applied* this passage of the Apostle in direct opposition to the very *scope* of it, which was to urg *Timothy* to constant *preaching* in our and the common sence of the word, as the most effectuall means to cure people of that *itching* desire after such new *Doctrines* and *Fables* as wou'd please their wanton fancys or vitious Inclinations. Whereas the Bp. imagines that the Apostle here condems the People's fondness for such *Sermons* as the very fault they were to be cur'd of, and so strangely mistakes the *Remedy* for the *Disease.* I confess how much soever our *Ears* may *itch* after *Novelty* and *Variety*, yet he cou'd not reasonably expect they wou'd be *charm'd* with *contradictions*, which instead of *tickling* 'em *grate* upon 'em. And truly if our Author gives us no better *Exposition* and *Application* of Scripture then this, Wee'l be much rather satisfy'd he shou'd only *read* it to us, For then there wou'd be less danger of misunderstanding it. But I wonder why his Lp. shou'd tell us of *Prayers* and *Praises* of *God's appointment*? Dos he not know the *Collects* of the *Liturgy* are as much of human Composure as our *free prayers*? Why then shou'd they be any more compar'd to *Angels Food* then ours, which are rather more agreeable to scriptural *precept* and *Pattern*? Nay, if the Scriptures read be *Sermons* of *Gods Appointment*, they are not the less so, but the more for being *explain'd* and *applied*, as appears from this very direction of the Apostle to *Timothy*, *to preach the word to be instant in season, &c. to rebuke, &c.*

I shall conclude what relates to our practise with the concluding words of this chapter of the Bp's.

" But as *Aaron* to please the *Israelites* made the Golden Calf, " so some Ministers tho contary to their own principles have chang- " ed God's Institution to please their People, and left out the con- " stant regular Reading God's word because their People grew weary " of it. But let all men judg who behave themselves most like the " faithful Ministers of Christ, We who keep to the reading God's " word according to his own Institution, whether the People will " hear or forbear, or they that comply with 'em and lay aside God's " command to oblige and please 'em.

Answ. I have already consider'd the injustice of this charge, And only add, That those more *fully comply with God's command*, who *read* and *expound* then those that only *read*. And I am sure as the *Dissenters* practise herein costs 'em more labour, so, if their People be not more edify'd by it, It must be their own fault. With what justice then or indeed with what sense dos his Lp. compare the *Dissenters* practise herein to *Aarons making a Golden Calf to please the People*? Are indeed Lectures and Sermons such dangerous *Idols*, Or is Hearing the Scriptures *expounded* when *read* so pernicious a piece of *Idolatry*? Is not the *Interpretation* of Scripture as truly a divine Ordinance as the *Reading* of it? And will any man that considers what he saith set the *one* in opposition to the *other*? Or rather wou'd not the confining Ministers to the *Reading* the Scriptures only, tend to debase 'em into such a sort of *Priests* as *Jeroboam* made *of the meanest of the People* when he set up the Worship of the *Golden Calves*. 1 Kings 12. 31. I mean such *Priests* as need little other furniture for their publick Ministrations then their *book* and their *eyes*, and are under no obligation to *study* the Scriptures because they are under no necessity of *interpreting* 'em to the People? And what a sort of Clergy are to be found in *Russia*, *Muscovy*, and other parts of the Christian World, where they are turn'd into meer *Readers*, we have so sad accounts from *History*, that if his Lp. intend to turn his Clergy into such, by thus discouraging Sermons as an *human Invention*, I shou'd not blame the *dissenting* ministers for being loth to come under his conduct and regulation.

I

I shall conclude this Chapter with observing in reference to the practise of the *Establish't Church.*

1. That I suppose the Bp. will not pretend any Warrant from *precept* or *Example* in the *Holy Scriptures*, for the reading such uninspired Books as those of the *Apocrypha* together with the Canonical Writings of the *Old* and *New Testament* in the time of publick Worship: And therefore I hope he'l censure this himself for one of his *human Inventions.* Especially since himself owns there is a tenth part of the old Testament left out of the Churches order for the Reading it, sure to exclude that and introduce in the stead of it, the story of *Bell* and the *Dragon*, *Tobit* and his *Dog*, &c. looks very like the preferring meer human Composures (some of which contain fooliſh and incredible Relations) before that part of God's living Oracles. Not to mention how little care is taken to distinguish 'em when read from the Canonical Scriptures, and prevent the common people's mistaking 'em for such. But however his Lp's prudence is commendable in taking no notice of this matter, because those *Accusations* are best past over in silence, against which there is no *defence.*

2. That the common practise of the *Conforming* Clergy in the Countrey, of having only one *Sermon* on the Lord's day, nay in the far greatest number of *Parishes* of having no publick Worship at all one part of the day, is a defect that needs some effectual Reformation.

3. That the *Dissenters* seem to have better reason to blame the *Conforming* Clergy for casting out the *Exposition* of the Scripture when read (as that Exercise is now distinguish't from *Sermons*) then the Bishop to reproach them for not *reading* the Scripture.

Remarks

Remarks on the Chapter concerning Bodily Worship.

And here First, As to the *Directions* of the *holy Scriptures* concerning it.

1. I Do readily agree with the Bp, *That Bodily Worship is Commanded in the Scriptures.*

Not that I suppose it (as his Lp. dos) to be a distinct *part* of Worship from *Prayer*, *Praise*, *&c.* but only a suitable *Adjunct* of it, (of which more afterwards).

2. I do agree with him also, that the most common *postures* of *Bodily Worship* mention'd in Scripture, as us'd in *Thanksgivings* and *Prayers* were *prostration*, *kneeling* or *standing*. As to this last of *standing*, the Bp. takes notice of it as us'd in *Thanksgivings*, and *p.* 143. owns it to have been a *Scripture-posture* in *Prayer* too. But since he gives no instances of it, as us'd in *Prayer*, I shall take leave to subjoyn a few, and the rather because this is the *posture* the *Dissenters* most generally use in this duty when publickly perform'd.

Of this *posture* in *Prayer*, the best Expositors understand *Abraham's standing before the Lord*, 18 *Gen.* 22. Thus the *Levites stood* up in that *Confession* and *Prayer* they made, 9 *Neh.* 4. *&c.* So to *cry to God*, and *stand up*, are us'd as synonimous expressions, 30 *Job* 20. And 15 *Jer.* 1. *Moses* and *Samuel's standing before God* is put for *praying to him.* So also, 18 *Jer.* 20. And accordingly it was (as *Grotius* observes, on 6 *Matt.* 5.) the most universally-receiv'd custom among the Jews to pray *standing*. Thus, 18 *Luke*, 10, 11.

Two men went up to the Temple to pray, and *ſtanding* is the religious poſture us'd by each of 'em. So 11 *Mark.* 25. When ye *ſtand* praying, forgive, *&c.* Hence *Prayers* were not only call'd *Stations* by the *Jews* (among whom it was a celebrated ſaying, *That without ſtations the world cou'd not ſubſiſt*) but alſo by ſome of the moſt ancient *Chriſtian* Writers. For the *Chriſtians* not only imitated the *Jews* in this religious poſture, but becauſe they accounted their *Lord's-days* their joyful *Feſtivals*, they forbad kneeling on 'em, and requir'd *ſtanding*.

3. As *Prayer* and *Thankſgiving* are ſuch Acts of Worſhip wherein we immediately addreſs our ſelves to God, ſo *hearing* ſeems rather to be a *mediate* act of Worſhip, and therefore the ſame poſture of devotion ſeems not neceſſary therein, as in our *direct* Addreſſes to him. And hence we read of *ſitting*, as the poſture us'd in this part of Divine Worſhip, 33 *Ezek. v.* 31 — And this is practis'd both in their Congregations and ours.

Being thus eaſily agreed as to the *Directions* of Scripture, It remains that we conſider

Secondly, the *Application of 'em*, In which the Bp. undertakes to repreſent the *Principles* and *Practice* of the *Diſſenters*.

I. As to our *Principles*, He ſaith, *You do not allow Bodily Adoration to be any part of God's Worſhip.*

Anſw. If he mean that the *Diſſenters* do not ſuppoſe that *God is to be worſhipt with our body as well as ſpirit*, and that we are not oblig'd to uſe ſuch external poſtures and behaviour as may moſt fitly expreſs our inward reverence of God and ſubjection to him, nothing can be more groundleſs than to affirm this concerning 'em. But if his Lp mean, that they do not allow bodily poſtures of devotion to be in the ſame ſenſe a *part of religious worſhip*, as *Prayer, Praiſe, Hearing, &c.* are, It is true; And they think he has made a very unaccurate enumeration of the parts of Worſhip, when he has omitted *Baptiſm*, which is one undoubted *part* of it, and made thoſe devout poſtures a *part*, which are more properly an *Adjunct* of it. For they are not a diſtinct *Duty* from *Prayer* and *Praiſe*, *&c.* but relate to the *manner* of performing 'em, which ſhou'd be fit to repreſent

present our profound veneration for that glorious Majesty whom we adore. And in vain dos he refer us to what he had said, *p.* 105, 106. *&c.* for the proof of these devout bodily postures being in this sense a *part* of Worship. For we find nothing more there, then that God requires these external marks of our inward Reverence, when we offer up our *Prayers* or *Thanksgivings*, and has forbidden our paying 'em to any *graven Image*, that accordingly it was the practice of holy men both in the *Old* and *New Testament*, to offer these parts of worship to God in such devout postures; And that the Scriptures frequently call these external postures of devotion by the name of *Worship*, on the account of their being the outward expressions, or the visible marks and signs of it. All which we readily grant; But if he had said any thing to the purpose, he shou'd have prov'd, that meer *bowing the knee*, or *prostration*, *&c.* when there was no other part of worship offer'd, neither *vocal* nor *mental*, is yet made in Scripture a *part of Worship*; which as he has not yet done, so I presume he will not in hast do it. He dos indeed tell us, *p.* 110. that *bodily worship is the most proper external Act of Adoration, that Praying, Praising, &c. are not in Scripture termed Worship, and that these are not immediate direct Worship properly so call'd, because they do not, as bending or bowing the body, directly signify the subjection of our minds to God, in which inward Worship properly consists*, and accordingly he tells us, *the words us'd for Worship in the Old and New Testament signify properly and originally some bodily Action.*

Answ. That those bodily actions, which are external marks of reverence towards God, and subjection to him, are call'd in Scripture *Worship*, has been already granted; But the reason why they are call'd *Worship* in general, rather than *Prayer* and *Praise*, *&c.* is not because *these latter are not immediate direct Worship properly so call'd*, but because these bodily actions are the external expressions of religious reverence and homage common to all these several parts of direct and immediate Worship. For there is a more direct signification of our subjection to God in our *prayers*, when we expressly declare therein our humiliation for our sins, implore the pardon

of

of 'em, acknowledge the rightful Authority of God over us, and renew our vows of Obedience to him, than can be suppos'd in any external *postures* whatsoever. The signification of our homage by *words* being more distinct, clear, and full, than by *gestures*. I might say the same of those *praises*, one great part whereof consists in celebrating the sovereign authority and dominion of God, as well as the perfections of his nature. So that these dutys do more directly express the devotion of our minds, tho postures of bodily reverence must be annext, because God must be glorify'd with our bodys as well as spirits

But he tells us, *The Directory not only leaves out, but excludes bodily Worship, by requiring all to take their seats, or places, without Adoration, or bowing themselves towards one place or other.*

And this the Bp. severely decrys, as a *Rule directly opposite to natural Reason, as well as to the Commands of God, and the examples of his Saints.*

Answ. If the *Bishop* had duly consider'd the true occasion of this Caution in the *Directory*, he wou'd not have put us under a necessity of reviving the memory of those faults that seem'd bury'd with their *Authors*, by straining those expressions of the *Directory* beyond the true intent of 'em. For 'tis well known this *Caution* was levelled against the manifold *bowings* and *cringings* which *A B Laud* had endeavour'd to introduce into the Church; who upon the vain conceit of some peculiar presence of Christ at the *Altar*, zealously propagated the custom of *bowing* towards it; And he having a great influence on the disposal of Church-preferments, on the account of his eminent station, and his great Interest at Court, All the aspiring Clergy were ready to strive who shou'd outdo each other in that sort of *bowing*, which was then the surest way to *rise*. The *Parliament* was greatly offended with these and the like *Innovations*, and especially at the rigor wherewith he had endeavour'd to impose 'em on the Inferior Clergy. Now the *Westminster-Assembly* (compos'd almost entirely of such as were *Conformists*) being call'd to reform such *Abuses*, do in order to the effectual banishing these *Innovations*, give this *Rule*, by which they intend

intend no more, than that no ſuch *external Adoration* or *bowing* ſhou'd be us'd by the people as they entred into the Church, becauſe they ſuppos'd ſuch *external Adoration* ſhou'd only be us'd when ſome *part* of publick worſhip was perform'd. But that they did by no means intend to forbid ſuch *external Adoration* when any *part* of publick worſhip was offer'd, that requir'd ſuch marks of our religious Reverence and Homage, is hence evident, *viz.* from their requiring ſuch as come in after publick Worſhip is begun, *reverently to compoſe themſelves to joyn with the Aſſembly in that Ordinance of God that is then in hand*, which can import no leſs than the putting themſelves into a *bodily poſture* moſt ſutable to that Ordinance, and expreſſive of due veneration towards God in it. 'Tis true indeed, as to the particular *poſture*, they leave the people to that liberty the Scripture has done, which tho it recommend ſeveral, yet dos not confine us to any one to the excluſion of the reſt. So that his Lp. has palpably miſrepreſented this Rule of the *Directory* (on that occaſion too needful and juſtifiable) that he might have ſome pretence to find fault with it. For as I have here explain'd it to him, he may eaſily ſee, 'tis neither *contrary to reaſon nor Scripture*, but only to a ſuperſtitious cuſtom, of *A. B. Laud's Invention*, or at leaſt to one authoriz'd and impos'd by him.

II. Since then the Bp. has no juſt quarrel with the *Principles*, let's conſider what he has to ſay againſt the *practice* of Diſſenters. And here he tells us,

1. *At your Thanksgivings and Praiſes you neither bow nor ſtand up.*

Anſw. If he mean this of our *ſinging of Pſalms*, He knows our poſture is the ſame herein with that us'd in the *Pariſh Churches*, and liable to no other objections, than theirs. If he intends it of thoſe *Thanksgivings* we offer up together with our *Prayers*, what he here aſſerts, if he ſpeak of the *Diſſenters* in general, is notoriouſly untrue, and contrary to plain matter of fact, as I ſhall have occaſion to obſerve farther in his charge that refers to our *Prayers*.

2. *He charges us with casting out of our Worship the Confessions of Faith themselves, which he tells us are a material part of the service of God, for which he cites,* 10 *Rom.* 9, 10. *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God has rais'd him from the dead, thou shalt be sav'd, p.* 129.

Answ. Why dos his Lp. think the bare citation of that Text a sufficient proof of what he here infers from it, when he knows well enough, that these words are by the stream of all judicious Commentators understood concerning the *external profession of the Christian Religion* in general, (which we especially make in our attendance on all the publick Institutions of our Lord) but by none that I can meet with besides himself concerning the *repetition of a summary of the Christian Faith* in our publick Assemblys. If they were to be understood of the latter, 'tis but a very short *summary* we are here requir'd to repeat, and such a one as we never perform any part of Divine Worship without repeating much more. But for the repeating that particular *summary* commonly call'd the *Apostle's Creed*, or any other later one of human composure, there's not one word in this place, nor indeed any *precept* or *example* in Scripture. So that the *Rehearsal of such a Confession of Faith*, is, according to the Bp's notion, a meer *human Invention*. And yet I am far from condemning the practice of the *Establisht Church* in rehearsing the *Apostle's Creed*; and have known it retain'd in some Meetings of *Dissenters*. Only I see no reason why those that use it, shou'd censure those that do not, when there is no clear warrant for it. And the Bp. shou'd, of all men, be least forward to do it.

3. *He accuses the Dissenters of sitting generally at their publick Prayers.*

Answ. If he speak here of the generality of *Dissenters* in *England*, and in this part of *Ireland*, what he saith is notoriously untrue. I know few or none that do it, except such as pretend *bodily infirmity*, in which case I suppose the Bp. himself will allow it as much as to a sick man to pray in his bed. If he design this charge only in reference to the *Dissenters* in the *North* of *Ireland*, where

where alone there ſeems to be any ground given for it, I ſhall firſt repreſent to him what account the Miniſters there give of this matter, and then add my own thoughts in reference to it. Now they not only affirm, that the better ſort of their Hearers do generally *ſtand*, but that they frequently in their Diſcourſes to 'em recommend that, or *kneeling*, as the fitteſt poſture, where bodily infirmity dos not hinder it. But they dare not be too peremptory in their cenſuring thoſe that pretend ſuch infirmity, ſince many of their people travel 3 or 4 miles to their Meetings, and may therefore be reaſonably ſuppos'd to be incapable of long *ſtanding* without danger of diſcompoſing their minds for the Worſhip of God. And for *kneeling*, the places where they meet are uſually too much crouded to admit of their uſing that poſture. And there are ſome of 'em think their *ſitting* in ſuch caſes warranted by Scriptural pattern, particularly the inſtance of *David's ſitting before the Lord*, 2 *Sam.* 7, 8. As to this account, I ſhall only briefly ſubjoyn, that I am truly ſorry there are ſo many that by *ſitting* in publick *Prayer*, have given ſome occaſion for this cenſure of the Bp's. For tho I doubt not, real infirmity is a juſt excuſe for not *ſtanding*; yet 'tis too probable, that too many under that notion too far conſult their eaſe; for *ſtanding* is generally us'd by *Diſſenters* in *England*, even in thoſe places where many of the people go as far to their Meetings. And for that paſſage alledg'd, 2 *Sam.* 7, 8. I do truly think there is ſome weight in what the Bp. has offer'd, to render it probable that the word ſhou'd be tranſlated, *David ſtayed*, or *abode*. And certainly ſo many plainer and more numerous examples of *kneeling* or *ſtanding* are to be rather imitated by us than this doubtful one of *ſitting*. So that for ſuch as uſe this ſlothful poſture without real neceſſity, to endulge their eaſe, I cannot excuſe 'em from *irreverence* in it. And hope they will not perſiſt in a practice ſo offenſive to their brethren elſewhere, and diſlik't by their Paſtors. And methinks they ſhou'd be ſenſible of the indecency of it, if they conſider, that they themſelves univerſally *kneel* or *ſtand* in *Cloſet* and *Family-prayer*, and 'tis unaccountable why they ſhou'd not as univerſally do it in *publick prayer*, where their bodily

bodily ſtrength will permit. But then I muſt add, as to his Lordſhip, that as he has no reaſon to reproach the *Diſſenters* in general with this unſeemly practice, ſo, ſince the Miniſters in the *North* have ſo faithfully declar'd to their people their diſlike of it, they can no more juſtly be upbraided with it, than the *Conforming Clergy* with all that *toying* and *triſling*, and that more *open irreverence* that is too common in many *Pariſh-Churches*, and much more in the *Cathedrals*.

4. His next Charge is, *At the Sacrament you ſit, not only whilſt you receive, but at the Thanksgiving and Bleſſing before. And this poſture* (he ſaith) *the Directory impoſes on the Communicants, tho contrary to ſcripture, in reſpect of that part which concerns the Prayer and Thanksgiving, and without any command, or ſo much as example from Scripture, in reſpect of the ſitting at the time of receiving.*

Anſ. That the *Diſſenters* generally *ſit* at the *thanksgiving* or *bleſſing* before *Receiving* (or at the *thanksgiving* after it) is again notoriouſly contrary to matter of fact. If this be practis'd by ſome in the *North* of *Ireland*, they are *ſingular* in it, nor ſhall I undertake to excuſe 'em in it. For tho they alledge for it not only the example of the multitude's *ſitting* at a common meal when our Saviour *gave thanks*, 14 *Matth.* 19. but that there's no evidence of the Apoſtles diſcontinuing their *Table-geſture*, when Chriſt paſt from the Celebration of the *Paſſover* to the Celebration of his *holy Supper* (For the Text ſaith, *As they were eating, Jeſus took the bread, and bleſt it, &c.* without any mention of a change of their poſture); yet becauſe this is but a doubtful matter, I think it far ſafer to uſe the poſtures of Reverence more generally recommended to us in our *Thanksgivings* and *Prayers* by the Scripture, than to venture to omit them on ſo uncertain a ground.

But I wonder why the Bp. ſhou'd ſo poſitively aſſert that the *Directory* impoſes on *Communicants* this poſture of *ſitting* at the *Thanksgiving* and *Prayer* before *Receiving*. For I can ſee no ground for it from their own words, which I perceive his Lp. was too wiſe

wise to quote, and I shall therefore cite for him, and leave the judgment to every indifferent Reader.

After this Exhortation, Warning and Invitation, The Table being before decently cover'd, and so conveniently plac't that the Communicants may orderly sit about it, or at it, The Minister is to begin the Action with sanctifying and blessing the elements of Bread and Wine set before him; The Bread in comely and convenient Vessels, &c. Now 'tis plain, that these words about ordering the Table come in as a *parenthesis*, and can import no more than that the *Table* must be so *plac't*, that the Communicants may *sit* at or about it; but that they must actually *sit* during the *Blessing*, or *Thanksgiving*, is no way *affirm'd*, much less *impos'd*; and I am sure the quite contrary is generally *practis'd*.

But for *sitting* during the time of *Receiving* the elements, that indeed is *suppos'd*, tho not *enjoyn'd* by the *Directory*, and is generally *practis'd* by *Dissenters*.

I hope his Lp. dos not think our practice herein *unlawful*, since he declares, *p.* 118. *'Tis not his intention to assert that the Scriptures require kneeling at the Lord's Supper*, *p.* 118. If then the debate be, whether our posture, or theirs, comes nearer to the *practice* of the *Apostles*, and is more sutable to the nature of the *Institution* it self, I think the *Dissenters* will have the advantage. And since his Lp. has stated the controversy thus, I shall carefully examine what he has here offer'd in favour of their practice, as preferable to ours.

He tells us, *p.* 118, 119. "That the Altar was of old the Lord's-"Table, from whence his Attendants were fed, from 1 *Mal.* 7. "That on this account the Israelites came to the Altar, and wor-"shipt before it, as being God's Table, on which the sacrifice "was presented as his meat, of which they were permitted to "partake. From 2 *Chron.* 6. 12, 13. and in 1 *Kings* 8. 54. 2 *Kings* "18. 22. That the Communion-Table is call'd the Lord's-Table, "1 *Cor.* 10. 21. That the Israelites partaking of the Altar, is pro-"pos'd as an example for our partaking of the Lord's Table, 1 *Cor.*

" 10. 16, 18. That in 22 *Pſ.* 29. there is an alluſion to this reli-
" gious eating with bodily worſhip, That we muſt receive the
" *Euchariſt* in remembrance of Chriſt's death, whom we are com-
" manded to worſhip, 45 *Pſ. v.* 11. See *p.* 118, 119, and 120.

Anſw. His Lp. has ſo ill hap in his *Criticiſms*, that he has directed us here to one of the ſtrongeſt arguments that I know of againſt himſelf. And to make this good, I muſt ſet this account of the *Jewiſh Sacrifices* in a clearer light, which he has treated ſo confuſedly.

The Learned Dr. *Cudworth* in his excellent *Treatiſe on the Lord's-Supper as a Feaſt upon a Sacrifice*, divides the *Jewiſh ſacrifices* into three ſorts.

1. Such as were wholly offer'd up to God, and burnt on the Altar, and theſe were call'd *Burnt-Offerings*.

2. Such wherein beſides ſomething offer'd to God on the Altar, the Prieſts had alſo a part of, and theſe he ſubdivides into the *Sin* and *Treſpaſs-Offering*.

3. Such wherein, beſides ſomething offer'd to God, and a portion beſtow'd on the Prieſts, the Owners themſelves had a ſhare, and theſe were call'd *Peace-Offerings*.

Now in all *Sacrifices* there was a *Feaſt* upon 'em. For the firſt ſort of *ſacrifices*, *viz.* *Burnt-offerings* had always *Peace-offerings* annext. In the 2d ſort, tho the Owners did not eat of it themſelves, as not being perfectly reconcil'd, becauſe of ſome legal uncleanneſs, yet the Preiſts did eat of it as their proxys. But in *Peace-offerings*, the Owners are ſuppos'd fully reconcil'd, and were admitted to eat of the Sacrifice themſelves, as a *fœderal* rite of amity and peace between God and them; For God entertain'd 'em as his Gueſts at his Table, and feaſted 'em with his proviſions, according to the cuſtom of thoſe Oriental Nations of confirming Covenants by eating and drinking together. Now Chriſt's *offer-*

fering himself a sacrifice on the Cross, was most directly typify'd by the *Burnt-offering*, and the *Lord's-Supper* is a *mystical Feast* upon the memorials of that *Sacrifice*, in allusion to these religious *Feasts* upon *Sacrifices* under the Law of *Moses*.

From hence it plainly follows, that if the practice of the *Jews* in reference to their *Feasts* upon the legal *Sacrifices* be the fittest pattern for ours in our *Feast* on the memorials of the *Sacrifice* of Christ in the *Lord's-Supper*, (as the Bp. dos with very good reason assert; when from 1 *Cor.* 10, 16. he tells us, *That the Israelites partaking of the Altar, is propos'd as an example of our partaking of the Lord's-Table, p.* 119.) then we must use the same posture in our receiving the *Lord's-Supper*, which they us'd in those Religious Feasts upon *Sacrifices*, of which the *Lord's-Supper* is the Antitype. If then the Jews celebrated those *Feasts* in a *Table-gesture*, we shou'd use the same *gesture* in our celebration of the *Lords-Supper*. The Bp. wou'd indeed persuade us that the Jews did not, because we read of acts of external Worship paid to God at the *offering* up of *sacrifices*. But 'tis plain this argument has no force in it, unless he cou'd prove they continu'd in that *worshipping posture* during the time of their *eating* or *feasting* on the things that had been offer'd. But of this he has not brought us the least shadow of proof, as he may see, if he review his own discourse on this head. Nay, we do in our celebration of the Lord's-Supper first *offer* up acts of Worship to God (I mean solemn thanksgivings and prayers, in which we celebrate his infinite mercy, in giving his Son to dye, as the great propitiation for our sins, and by Faith as it were present that sacrifice to the Father, and implore his pardon in vertue of it) before we *sit* down to *feast* upon the memorials of Christ's *sacrifice*. And tho I might here content my self with shewing the invalidity of his argument, yet for once to do a work of supererogation, I shall prove that the Jews did celebrate these religious *Feasts* upon sacrifices, not in a *worshipping-posture*, but in a *Table-gesture*, not *kneeling*, *&c.* but *sitting*.

His

e Dr. llingfl. of his of I- ary, p. , &c.

His Lp. knows that all our Protestant Divines plead against the Papists, that the golden Calf was worshipt by the Israelites no otherwise than as a visible *symbol* of the true God, and with the accustomed *rites* which they us'd in the worship of him. Of which *rites* we have this plain account, 32 *Exod.* 5, 6. *And when* Aaron *saw it* (*i. e.* the golden Calf, concerning which they said, *These are thy Gods, O Israel, that brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, v.* 4.) *he built an Altar before it, and made proclamation, saying, To morrow is a Feast to the Lord, or to Jehovah.* And it follows, *And they rose up early in the morning, and offer'd Burnt-offerings, and brought Peace offerings, and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.* Where their *sitting down to eat and drink* was their celebrating this religious *Feast* upon the *sacrifice*, the *Peace-offerings* being the *provisions* they fed on. And accordingly when the Apostle *Paul* has occasion to mention this Instance of their *Idolatry*, he recites no more than their *siting down to eat and drink, &c.* that being a sufficient evidence of their joyning in the *Sacrifices*, on which this was the Religious *Feast*. Of such a *feast* upon a *sacrifice* we have a remarkable instance given us, 1 *Sam.* 9. 12, 13. compar'd with the 22 *v. v.* 12, 13. And they answer'd 'em and said, *He is, behold, he is before you, make hast now, for he came to day to the City, for there is a Sacrifice of the people to day in the high-place. Assoon as ye come into the City ye shall straitway find him, before he go up to the high-place to eat, for the people will not eat till he come, because he dos bless the Sacrifice, and afterwards they eat that be bidden; and v.* 22. we read that *Samuel* took *Saul* and his *Servant* and brought 'em into a *Parlour*, and made 'em *sit* in the chiefest place among them that were *bidden*, which were about 30 persons. So that *sitting* was evidently their posture in this *Religious Feast* upon the Sacrifice. Such a *religious Feast* was that mention'd, 1 *Sam.* 16. 6. *&c.* and *sitting* was again their posture in the celebration of it. See 57 *Is.* 7 23 *Ezek.* 41. in both which places *sitting* was the accustom'd rite in all those *Feasts* upon Sacrifices among other Nations as well as the Jews. So, 2 *Amos* 8. And of such *Feasts* on Sacrifices, see more 34 *Exod.* 15. 18 *Exod.* 12. 106 *Ps.* 28.

And

And from hence we may not only infer (according to the Bp's own argument) that *sitting* at this mystical *Feast* on the memorials of Christ's Sacrifice is hereby warranted as *lawful*, but that 'tis most *agreeable* to the nature of the *Institution* it self, as the *Lord's-supper* is, *Epulum ex oblatis*. Nay this posture seems hereby recommended to us, as most fit to signify our partaking of the precious vertue and fruits of the *sacrifice* of Christ, and the honour the blessed God puts upon us when he admits us to *sit* down as *Guests* at his holy Table, in token of our being *receiv'd into a state of amity and peace with him*. And we are not (as the Bishop groundlesly supposes, *p.* 120.) requir'd to offer immediate Worship to *Christ*, or to the *Father* in the act of *Receiving* at all. We are indeed then requir'd to *eat and drink in remembrance of our blessed Saviour*; but this rather argues that *meditation* is then our proper business, and not *prayer* or *praise*; any farther than some ejaculatory *desires* or *thanksgivings* may be intermixt in our *meditations*. But for solemn *Worship* we have proper occasion for it, both before and after this mystical *Feast*, and in that we do use a *worshipping* posture. And as none that know our *principles* can question our paying divine honour to Jesus Christ as the *Incarnate Word*, or *God manifested in the flesh*, so none can reasonably imagin our celebrating this Feast upon his sacrifice in the *posture* most sutable to such *Religious Feasts*, to be a denial of his *Divinity*; And therefore we are little concern'd in the order of the Protestant Churches of *Poland*, in opposition to the *Socinians*; If they thought this rite of *sitting* to be of *ill signification* and *original*, it appears from what has been said that they were mistaken; but as *kneeling* is of a far more suspicious *original*, so we are sure it has been abus'd to the vilest *Idolatry*.

For his first Answer, *That we are not requir'd, nor is it convenient to imitate all that Christ did, And that the Apostle Paul mentions not this posture as any part of what he had receiv'd from Christ concerning this Sacrament*, I need only Reply, That 'tis certainly *safest* to imitate the example of the Apostles in such a *posture* as is evidently most agreeable to the nature of the Institution. And tho the A-

 postle

poſtle *Paul* dos not expreſly mention it as receiv'd from Chriſt, yet he ſufficiently intimates ſo much to us, when in the foregoing Chapter he compares this *Feaſt* on Chriſt's ſacrifice with the *Religious Feaſts* on the Jewiſh ones, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17, 18, *&c.* in which this *poſture* was ſo univerſally receiv'd, that there was no need of expreſſing it.

For his ſecond Anſwer, *That he has prov'd religious eating was accompany'd with bodily Worſhip, and therefore if it were granted that we were oblig'd to Receive this Sacrament in a Table poſture, from the example of our Saviour, yet it wou'd not follow that we ſhould not receive it kneeling, &c. p.* 123, 124.

Repl. It appears ſufficiently from what has been already alledg'd, that the Bp. confounds the *Worſhip* paid when the Sacrifice was *offer'd* with the *poſture* us'd when they came to *feaſt* upon it. And I have already produc't him undeniable evidence, that they celebrated their Religious *Feaſts* upon Sacrifices *ſitting*, or in the ſame poſture as their other meals, and never *kneeling*, or in a *worſhipping* poſture; And conſequently it will follow, that if we ſhou'd receive it in a Table-geſture, we muſt receive it ſitting, and not kneeling.

For his third Anſwer, *That our Saviour was not at a common Supper when he inſtituted this Sacrament, but at the Paſsover, which was a ſacramental eating, and had a peculiar poſture preſcrib'd for it,* 12 Exod. 11. *and tho ſome think (but without warrant from Scripture) that the Jews did not obſerve this, yet 'tis own'd they obſerv'd another, which differ'd from the common poſture of eating, and was accounted Religious; however 'tis ſpoken that our Saviour perform'd this eating with ſeveral religious Ceremonies that were not in the firſt Inſtitution. And he here inſtances in the Cup mention'd,* 22 Luke 17. *and therefore* (he adds) *if we wou'd imitate Chriſt, we ought to eat the Lord's-Supper in a way peculiar to it ſelf, and different from our common meals.*

Repl.

Repl. That our Saviour was celebrating the *Paſſover* when he inſtituted his *Supper* is undoubted, and that the *Paſſover* was no common *Supper*, is alſo true. For (as Dr. *Cudworth* has in the diſcourſe I mention'd before evidently prov'd) it was a *Religious Feaſt* upon a Sacrifice; But all this plainly concludes againſt his Lp, becauſe in every one of the three Evangeliſts, *Mathew*, *Mark* & *Luke*, there is expreſs mention of their *ſitting down* when they celebrated this *Religious Feaſt*. 26 *Matt.* 20. 14 *Mark* 18. 22 *Luke* 14. ἀνακείμενων, ἀνέκειντο. For the *poſture* preſcrib'd, 12 *Exod.* 11. there is no expreſs mention either of their *ſitting* or *ſtanding*, and I do not ſee any clear ground thoſe few Expoſitors go upon, that conclude the Iſraelites were then to eat the Paſſover *ſtanding*, becauſe *they were to have their ſhoes on*; And even thoſe Expoſitors ſuppoſe this poſture of *ſtanding* to have been only us'd at that time, to ſignifie their haſt in fleeing from *Egypt* to be ſo great, that they had not time to eat otherwiſe, but to have been diſus'd afterwards, and the common *poſture* of other *Religious Feaſts* upon Sacrifices *reſum'd* in the celebration of this, *viz. ſitting*. And whereas he tell us, *That 'tis own'd the Jews obſerv'd a poſture in the Paſſover different from the common poſture of eating, and accounted Religious*, I muſt add, that his Lp. is ſtill unhappy in uſing arguments that make againſt himſelf. I perceive he was ſo prudent as not to tell us wherein this *poſture* us'd in eating the *Paſſover* differ'd from that us'd in their common *eating*. For all that I can find concerning it in the beſt Expoſitors, is only this. All agree that they did eat the *Paſſover ſitting*, but whereas in *ſitting at Table*, in their common meals, they ſometimes *ſat* with their bodys more *erect* and *ſtraight*, and ſometimes in a more *eaſie* poſture, *leaning* on one ſide, *Grotius*, *Buxtorf*, and Dr. *Lightfoot* tell us, the Jews did uſually in their *eating* the *Paſſover* rather chooſe this more *eaſy* poſture, and (as the laſt adds) to *ſignifie the more fully their freedom from that ſervitude to which their Anceſtors were ſubjected in Egypt*. So that of the two, this *poſture* had leſs of external reverence, than that ſometimes us'd in their common eating, and not more; For it was alſo us'd in their common eating, when they

kept

kept state, and endulg'd most their own *ease* and *pleasure*. So that if the Bp. can hence draw any argument against us, 'tis that our *posture* of *sitting upright* has rather too *much* of reverence in it then too *little*. For the *Cup* mention'd at *Luke* 17. I know not what it can signifie to his purpose, whether we suppose with *Grotius*, that 'twas usual to conclude the *Passover* with drinking round, or with others, admit of a *Transposition of the words*. 'Tis evident our *Saviour* observ'd the common *posture* of *Religious Feasts*, *viz.*, *sitting*, which posture they us'd also in their *common meals*, only in their religious *ones* they always us'd (as *Grotius* speaks) *sessione solitâ molliori et honoratiori*, the more soft and honourable way of sitting at meat.

" But his 4th. and full Answer is, That this argument drawn " from the practice of Christ and his Apostles goes on a false " supposition, that our Saviour instituted this Sacrament in the " common posture of eating, which no wise appears in Scripture, " neither can it be inferr'd from any thing said or intimated by " the Evangelists, or St. *Paul*, but rather the contrary. And to render the contrary more probable, he alledges, *that our Saviour and his disciples must be suppos'd to be in a worshiping posture when he gave thanks, and blessed the bread, and therefore that 'tis probable that he rose to bless and distribute the holy Sacrament, as he did to wash his Disciples feet*, 13 John 4. *tho there be no mention made in the three other Evangelists of his rising to do the former, any more than of his rising to do the latter.*

Repl. This is, I confess, a bold stroke, to call that so peremptorily a *false supposition*, which us'd to be allow'd us by those whose practice herein differs from ours, as most probable at least. But 'tis no unusual thing for some persons to supply the defect of an argument with an air of assurance in proposing it. And that the Bp's argument here has no force in it, I hope to convince him, if he will examin this matter without prejudice. I have shewn him before, that all the Evangelists agree that they *sat* in

in eating the *Passover*. He himself owns there is no mention made of their changing their posture when Christ instituted this *Sacrament*. All the strength of his argument then lyes on the probability of his *blessing* the elements in another *posture*, and consequently *distributing* 'em so. Now since the *Lord's-Supper* was an Antitype of the Jewish Religious *feasts* upon *Sacrifices*, If it appear, that that there were *solemn Thanksgivings* us'd in those *Jewish Feasts*, and yet notwithstanding those that ate of 'em *sat* while they ate, then this solemn *Blessing* or *Thanksgiving* us'd by Christ, gives us no ground to conclude that his Apostles did not *sit* in their celebrating this mystical *Feast* on his Sacrifice, but we have just reason to conclude the contrary; Now all Writers do agree, that in the *Passover-Feast* there was solemn *Thanksgiving* us'd, and yet all grant that Christ and his Apostles did eat it *sitting*. And the same may be observ'd in other *Religious Feasts* upon Sacrifices, in that mention'd, 1 *Sam.* 9. 13. we read expresly of the Sacrifice being first *blest* by *Samuel*, and yet we read as expresly of their *sitting* down when they came to *feast* upon it. So that the Bp's argument has no weight in it, since if applied to that *rite* in the *Jewish* Religion that's parallel to this in the *Christian*, it concludes false, and against plain matter of fact.

For his last Answer, " That the Apostle *Paul* severely reproves " the *Corinthians* for their irreverence in receiving this Sacra- " ment, and threatens 'em with damnation for not discerning " the Lord's-body, that is, for receiving it as their common food, " without distinguishing between 'em by a reverend and religi- " ous Receiving it. And that 'tis but a due distinction between " it and our common food, to approach to the Lord's-Table with " as much reverence as the *Jews* did to their Altar, at which they " never sat down.

Repl. What that *Irreverence* was which the Apostle reproves, he tells us, *That every one took before others his own Supper, and one was hungry, and another drunk*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 21, 22.

And this indeed was very groſs *irreverence*, and ſuch as ſhew'd they did not duly conſider the nature and deſign of this Inſtitution, as it was a common *feaſt* upon Chriſt's Sacrifice, wherin they were to commemorate his death, and ſpiritually partake of his *body* and *blood*, *i. e.* of all the precious fruits of his death and Sacrifice. But he dos by no means charge 'em with *irreverence* for *receiving* the *Bread* and *Wine* in the ſame poſture they did their *common food*, tho the relation here given of their practice renders it highly probable they did receive it ſo. His Reproof either relates to the inward exerciſe of their minds, that they did not approach that ordinance with that knowledg of, and Faith in a crucified Saviour, or with thoſe devout affections towards him, which became thoſe that receiv'd ſuch memorials of his body and blood; Or to their external depoſtment, that their manner of eating was *confuſs'd*, *diſorderly*, *uncharitable*, and *intemperate*, but not one word about their *not eating in a poſture of Worſhip*. The ſolemn *Thanksgivings* that precede and ſucceed our *Receiving*, as well as the *quality* of what we eat and drink, and its *conſecration* to this holy *uſe* are ſufficient to *diſtinguiſh* this *religious Feaſt* from our *common meals*. And tho the *Jews* might *kneel* at their *Altar* when with the *Sacrifice* they *offer'd* up their *Prayers*, yet I hope he is by this time convinc't they were far from *kneeling* at their *Religious Feaſts*, ſince they rather us'd the moſt eaſie way of *ſitting* in 'em.

If then it appear that *ſitting* was the poſture us'd by the *diſciples* of Chriſt when he adminiſtred this *ſacrament*, If this poſture be moſt agreeable to the nature of the *Inſtitution*, as 'tis a *Feaſt* on the Sacrifice of Chriſt, If the poſture ſeem to carry ſomething in it moſt fit to ſignify the honour God admits us to in vertue of that Sacrifice, (*viz. to be treated by him as his reconciled children and friends, by being Gueſts at his Table*), Then for any man *to cenſure this poſture as irreverent* (as the Biſhop ſeems to do, *p.* 144.) is little better than to reproach the *Apoſtles* of Chriſt, and their bleſſed Maſter to; and to refuſe this poſture on pretence

tence of *humility*, is to refuſe an endearing mark of God's peculiar favour and condeſcention to us; And tho I am ſo charitable notwithſtanding all this, that I dare not poſitively condemn *kneeling* as *unlawful*, yet how the Bp. will defend it from the ſtroke of his own *Principles*, I cannot tell. For if this be the true account of the matter, *kneeling* is a way of celebrating this part of divine Worſhip, which is neither *expreſly commanded in Scripture, nor warranted by any example there*, nay ſet up to the excluſion of that way which we have plain *example* for, and which is moſt ſutable to the nature of the Inſtitution; let him then try how he will defend the lawfulneſs of it without contradicting himſelf.

And thus much for the poſture us'd in the celebration of the *Lord's-ſupper*. But before I come to conſider that Inſtitution it ſelf, I muſt add a few Remarks on ſome remaining paſſages in his 3d. Section of this Chapter about *Bodily Worſhip*.

His 5*th* Charge is, *Too many of your Perſuaſion condemn us who conform to God's Word in theſe particulars, as guilty of Superſtition, and endeavour to render our Conformity ridiculous, &c.*

Anſw. If he mean that many of the *Diſſenters* condemn and ridicule them for uſing the forementiond ſcriptural poſtures of Devotion, I cannot imagin what ground he has for what he aſſerts. I have converſt with 'em much more than his Lordſhip, and I never cou'd hear any ſuch thing from 'em. I confeſs many *Diſſenters* may condemn ſuch practices among 'em as *bowing towards the Eaſt*, (or as the *Laudians towards the Altar*), *bowing at the Name of Jeſus* rather than that of *Chriſt*, or the name of the *Father*, or of the *holy Spirit*, or the name of *God*, or *Jehovah*, (as if there were ſome peculiar reverence due to thoſe five *Letters*). The *Reading in the Cathedrals one part of their Service in the body of the place, and the other at the Altar*, when there's no Communion to be celebrated, *the ſtanding up* at the *Reading one* part of the Scrip-

Scriptures more than *another*, when *all* have the ſame ſtamp of Divine Authority; And the Biſhop himſelf has put a very good argument into their mouths againſt 'em; For theſe are *ways of Worſhip* that have neither ſcriptural *precept* or *pattern*, and therefore according to his *Principle* muſt be ſuppos'd to be *human Inventions diſpleaſing to God.*

To theſe particular Accuſations he adds this general one,

In ſhort, I entreat you to conſider that you have not one viſible act of Adoration among you in your Aſſemblys, except we reckon in this number that your men uncover their heads at Prayer, and yet even this is not requir'd by your Directory.

Anſw. If he ſpeak of *Diſſenters* in general, Is it not ſtrange he ſhou'd ſo confidently out-face the Truth in matters of fact; when 'tis ſo notorious, That *ſtanding*, which is a *viſible* and a *ſcriptural* poſture of Adoration is ſo generally us'd by *Diſſenters* in all their *Thankſgivings* and *Prayers*? If ſome in the *North* of *Ireland* are too negligent herein, 'tis the fault of thoſe particular perſons, and no more juſtly chargeable on the body of *Diſſenters*, than the far groſſer irreverence of too many of her Members is chargeable on the Eſtabliſht Church. For the *Directory*, It dos in general require *external Reverence*, but leaves the particular expreſſions and marks of it, as the Scripture has done to the people's liberty; And accordingly, as ſome that have convenience for it uſe *kneeling*, ſo the generality uſe *ſtanding*, becauſe there are few of our Meetings, but either the ſtraitneſs of the Seats, or the number of thoſe that meet, renders *kneeling* leſs practicable to the main part of the Congregation. And *ſtanding* is as undonbtedly a ſcriptural poſture of Devotion as *kneeling*.

Having thus clear'd matters of fact, I muſt add, That for the *pretences* he here produces for the neglect of *Bodily Worſhip*, 'tis evident the Body of *Diſſenters* are no way concern'd in 'em.

For

For I cou'd never yet meet with one of 'em that ever pretended that *bodily Worship* might be neglected. For even thole that *ſit* at Prayer (and weakly alledg the ſore-cited example of *David* for it) yet are *uncover'd*, and intend that as an expreſſion of their *reverence* in all acts of *immediate* worſhip. And much leſs did I ever hear any *Diſſenter* alledg ſuch trifling reaſons as theſe, for which his Lp. has not thought fit to produce any Author, and therefore I know none we can *father* 'em on but himſelf. And if he *fram'd* theſe arguments, he dos well to *anſwer* 'em; Or if he have met with ſome in his converſation of ſo ſottiſh an Opinion, that have no better pleas for it, 'tis but juſt he ſhou'd endeavour to ſhew 'em their miſtakes; But why he cannot confute ſuch weak people, without groſs *ſlanders* againſt thoſe that are no way concern'd in their errors, I know not; And I deſire his Lp. to conſider what elſe he can make of the following paſſages.

P. 137. Speaking of theſe external poſtures of Reverence, he ſaith, *In caſes of neceſſity we think they may lawfully be omitted; But you are taught that in no caſes they may be lawfully practis'd; You are taught rather to ſtay at home, than to conform in their outward geſtures or circumſtances. You are advis'd rather to abſtain all your lives from the Lord's-Supper, than receive it kneeling. Now if you think God hates 'em ſo much, &c. and accounts 'em a polluting his Ordinance, &c.*

Anſw. If his Lp. cannot produce ſo much as one among the Diſſenting Miniſters that ever taught their people, *That ſuch poſtures of bodily Worſhip may in no caſes be lawfully practis'd*, then I hope he will own himſelf guilty here of a very *immoral* practice. And if he can produce any ſuch perſon, I dare undertake that he ſhall be publickly cenſur'd by his Brethren for teaching ſo ſenſeleſs and ridiculous doctrine. But to make this a general charge againſt us, is the moſt inexcuſable aſperſion that he cou'd poſſibly caſt upon us, and ſuch as we muſt demand from him, that he either *prove*, or ingenuouſly *retract*. I might ſay the ſame

concerning our people's being taught rather to *stay at home* than to *conform in their outward gestures*, if he understand this of *Scriptural gestures* us'd in the *Establisht Church*. For what he adds as to *kneeling at the Lord's-Supper*, he cannot be ignorant that some of the most considerable Writers for the NC's Cause in *England* have defended the *lawfulness* of it, tho his Lp. cannot do it without contradicting himself. There are others indeed that do think it *unlawful*, because they think it not only unsutable to the nature and design of the Institution, but a needless *symbolizing* with the *Romish Church* in a posture abus'd to the most pernicious Idolatry, by which they are the more confirm'd in that Idolatry, notwithstanding the publick protestation of the *Establisht Church* against that *abuse*. I shall therefore only add, That if any refuse to receive the Sacrament *kneeling*, his Lp. has the least reason to blame 'em, who by the *Rubric* and *Canons* is oblig'd to give it to none in the Church but such as *kneel*; For sure 'tis a lesser fault to be too rigid and scrupulous as to our *own* practice, than to impose it on *others* too, and to deny them the priviledges of Christian Communion for want of conformity to an *unscriptural* gesture. If the former run into an extreme, moderate persons may have some right to reprove 'em, but those have none who run much farther into the other.

Again, What excuse can the Bp. have for that passage, *p.* 138, 139.

" But in your Meetings there is no obligation on any one " to signifie his concurrence with the Congregation in any or- " dinary act of worship either by word or gesture, and there- " fore this end of publick Assemblys, (*viz.* to signifie our sense " and belief of the Being, *&c.* of God, and to stir up the same " in others) is utterly defeated by you. The *Directory* dos not " require or allow the people so much as to signifie their assent " by adding their *Amen* to the Prayers or Thanksgivings there " offer'd. But on the contrary, you ridicule those that practice it, " pursuant to the directions and examples in Scripture. And

" as

" as to gestures, such as kneeling, standing, or bowing the body,
" you condemn 'em all as Relicts of Idolatry and Superstition.
" There remains therefore in your Assemblys nothing whereby
" the people may testifie their belief or assent to what they hear,
" which was one design of the Meeting. Thus, by turning all
" bodily Worship out of your Assemblys, you have made void
" this great end of 'em, and left no visible distinction whereby
" any one may signifie whether he assents to the Worship offer'd,
" or dissents from it. The whole assembly being to one another,
" meer Spectators and Hearers, not Joint-Worshipers.

Answ. His Lp. was I suppose weary of *retailing* his aspersions, and therefore here gives 'em to us by *whole-sale*. For 'tis not true that *there is no obligation on any in our Meetings to signifie his concurrence with the Congregation in any ordinary act of Worship by gesture.* For the *Directory* requires that such as come into the Congregation shou'd *reverently compose themselves to joyn with the Congregation in that Ordinance that is then in hand.* Which implys their joyning in such *devout gestures* as the nature of that particular Ordinance dos require. And their constant attendance on the several parts of publick Worship, with their *reverent* behaviour therein, is a publick *declaration* of their *joyning in it.* 'Tis again untrue, that the *Directory* dos not allow the people to signifie their assent to the publick Prayers and Thanksgivings by saying *Amen*. For the very *Catechism* compos'd by 'em in explication of the *Conclusion* of the *Lord's Prayer* implys the contrary, that we shou'd *in Testimony of our desire and assurance to be heard say Amen.* I confess I know not what sort of modesty has made it too usual among us not to repeat our *Amen* so loudly as is generally done in the *Parish-Churches*. And in this particular I am of the same judgment with the Reverend Author of that Sermon in the morning lectures on 1 *Cor.* 14. *v.* 16. who advises the pronouncing it more *audibly*. Nor do I know of any *Dissenters* that ridicule any Conformists for doing so. But, to charge us (as he here dos) *with condemning kneeling, standing,*

or bowing down, as Relicts of Idolatry and Superſtition, is ſo groſs a calumny, and ſo unbecoming a man that pretends to ſincerity & candour, that he is oblig'd in common juſtice to repair the wrong he has here done us. For *kneeling* and *ſtanding* are poſtures ſo univerſally us'd by the *Diſſenters*, and ſo frequently recommended and urg'd in their Printed Diſcourſes and Sermons, that they cannot, without the moſt ſtupid ſelf-contradiction, condemn 'em as *Relicts of Idolatry and Superſtition*; Nor did I ever hear of one perſon that ever ſcrupl'd the uſe of 'em. Some may indeed have cenſur'd *Kneeling at the Sacrament, bowing towards the Eaſt or the Altar, &c.* as ſuch *Relicts of Idolatry and Superſtition*; but what's this to the uſe of thoſe poſtures in Religious Worſhip in general, of which the Bp. here ſpeaks?

For thoſe weak people of whom he tells us, *p.* 141. That they object againſt *kneeling* and *ſtanding* in the Congregation, *that 'tis troubleſome to 'em*, They do indeed offer a very lazy excuſe; and if the Bp. has met with any ſuch, he dos well to ſhame 'em out of it. But I can by no means be of the Bp's opinion, that any leave them on this ſcore, becauſe they find a way of Worſhip among the Diſſenters *eaſier* than theirs; Nor do I find that a man can *ſleep* more ſecurely and quietly in the *Meetings* than in the *Pariſh-Churches*. I am ſure I have often heard ſuch ſlothful people awaken'd by ſevere reproofs in the *Diſſenters Aſſemblys* than in *theirs*. So that I ſuſpect thoſe will fail of their deſign, who come to our *Meetings* in hopes to take a more *undiſturbed Nap* there

The Biſhop ſeems, *p.* 143. to aſſert, *That kneeling in publick Prayer is a duty which we are bound to provide conveniency for*. But as he wiſely takes it for granted, inſtead of proving it, ſo he groundleſly imagins the *Diſſenters* to have ſome averſion to it, whereas I know of no poſture more univerſally us'd by 'em in that duty in their *Cloſets* or *Familys* where they have conveniency for it. And I have ſeen it frequently us'd in thoſe larger

Seats

Seats in their *Meetings* that were wide enough to allow room for it. So that I perceive his Lordſhip is as great a ſtranger to our judgment and practice, as if he liv'd in ſome remote part of the world, and yet pretends to give an account of it with as much confidence as if he had continually frequented our Aſſemblys. I think I may pretend to know 'em better, and therefore muſt in juſtice to 'em add, that in thoſe Meetings I have frequented, I have obſerv'd as great an appearance of *external Reverence* and *Devotion*, of *ſeriouſneſs* and *gravity* as in any other Proteſtant Churches whatſoever either at *home* or *abroad*.

The Biſhop concludes this Chapter with this Obſervation, "But the truth of the matter, as it ſeems to me, is, That "your neglecting to kneel at the moſt ſolemn of all Chriſtian "Ordinances, the Lord's-Supper, dos harden you againſt Re"verence in the other parts of Divine Worſhip: And it is "no wonder it ſhou'd do ſo; for if Reverence be not thought "neceſſary in that duty, it may well ſeem unneceſſary in any "other.

On which words I ſhall only add, That if by *Reverence* in that Ordinance of the Lord's-Supper, he means *kneeling* while we eat the Bread, and drink the Cup, I have ſhew'd him that the *Apoſtles* us'd no ſuch *Reverence*, and he may with the ſame juſtice reproach *them* as he dos *us*. But it will by no means follow, that we muſt not uſe a *worſhipping-poſture* when acts of immediate Worſhip are offer'd, becauſe we uſe it not, when no ſuch acts are requir'd; as none are, during our eating and drinking in remembrance of Chriſt in that Inſtitution. So that I may more juſtly obſerve, That his Lordſhip's neglecting ſo long to reaſon ſolidly, and to ſpeak Truth concerning the *Diſſenters*, has ſo harden'd him in the contrary practice, that he ſeems reſolv'd to go on in it to the end of the Chapter.

For the practice of the Eſtabliſht Church in reference to *Bodily Worſhip*, I need add nothing to what has been already obſerv'd, (*p.*123,124) concerning *bowing at the name of Jeſus, ſtanding up at the Reading ſome part of the Scriptures rather than others, Reading in the Cathedrals one part of their Service at the Communion-Table, where few of the people can hear it, &c.* For which practices the Bp. muſt either bring us expreſs ſcriptural *precept* or *pattern*, or muſt cenſure 'em for his ſort of *human Inventions*; and truly ſome of 'em look too like ſuperſtitious ones; For they are either us'd and retain'd for no reaſon at all, but meer arbitrary pleaſure, or for ſuch reaſons as include ſome ſuperſtitious conceit in 'em, as if ſome peculiar honour and homage were due to that name of our Saviour above others, And greater veneration were due to ſome part of Scripture above the reſt; And as if there were either ſome peculiar ſanctity in the *prayers*, or in the *place*, when they are read at the *Communion-Table*, or there were no better way of inſtructing the people in their obligation to Communicate, than by this dumb ſign of reading ſome part of the *Communion-Service* there.

Remarks

Remarks on the Fifth Chapter concerning the Lord's-Supper.

And here

I. FOr the *Account* he gives us of what the Scriptures prescribe concerning the *frequency of Celebrating this Institution*, I shall very easily agree with his Lp.

For tho I think his Reasoning from the time of *Celebrating the Passover*, and from the general Topic of our *doing it as often as we have conveniency for it*, is not very cogent to prove any obligation upon us to celebrate this Sacrament *every Lord's-day*, Yet I do think his other arguments from Scripture are of great weight to prove, that in the Apostles time this *Ordinance* was made one constant part of their *Lord's-days Worship*, and I think in past doubt that this was the universal practice of Christian Churches for several succeeding Ages. So that in this respect I fear that the Reformed Churches themselves have not yet come up to the practice of the truly primitive and Apostolical ones, as I truly think were highly desirable. Many learned Authors, both Conf's and N C's have freely deliver'd their judgments to the same purpose, and I know of none that have disputed the matter of fact on which their arguments for reviving this practice are founded. I know there are other judicious persons that do not think the arguments drawn thence to be demonstrative, and do still conceive the words, *As oft as ye eat this bread*, &c. and *do this as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*, to leave the *frequency* of performing

ing this duty to the determination of human prudence. And tho their exceptions do not so far weigh with me as to alter my judgment, yet I dare not be harsh in censuring such whose apprehensions herein are different from my own.

All the Debate then remaining between the Bp. and me, will be concerning

II. The Practice of the *Establisht Church* and that of the *Dissenters.*

For the practice of the *Establisht Church*, I wonder why he shou'd pretend their Church has provided for those that desire to Receive every *Lord's-day*, meerly because of her ordering some part of the *Communion-Service* to be read every *Lord's day*, when 'tis so publickly known that there is no *Bread* and *Wine* provided for such as may be dispos'd to *Communicate*; And why shou'd the people be taught their duty only by such *dumb signs* as that? or part of the *Communion-Service* be read when there's no *Communion* intended? He dos indeed very justly observe that the *Canons* require no more of every Parishioner, than that he Receives *thrice a year*; But why he shou'd lay the blame of their people's Receiving no oftner, on the ill example of the *Dissenters*, I cannot imagin. For if it appear that the *Dissenters* generally Receive far oftner than their *Canons* require, It will be very unaccountable how their example shou'd *encourage* that *negligence* of the *Conforming* Laity, which it rather *reproves*. I confess, for the method of driving men to the Sacrament by *punishment*, (if he intend this of the severe penaltys that follow upon a *Writ de Excommunicato Capiendo*) we do not much admire it. To be admitted to the Lord's-Table, we esteem so great a *Priviledg* and *Honour*, that we think none should partake of it, but such as do very earnestly *desire* and *seek* it, and are in the judgment of human charity well *fitted* and *prepar'd* for it, by *competent knowledg*, and *an inoffensive conversation*.

But

But we do by no means think those deserve to be admitted at all whom nothing else can prevail with to come to this *Sacrament*, but the fear of a *Prison*; and who are hal'd to that *Holy Table*, meerly to escape the *Jaylor's Clutches*. Nor is it reasonable to put Men under so strong Temptation to dissemble with God in so solemn Vows, for the preservation of their Secular Interest. And for those Dissenters that scruple *Kneeling*, Nothing cou'd be more Unchristian than to *deny* 'em the *Lord's Supper* without their compliance with that posture, and yet *punish* 'em for not receiving it in their *Parish Churches*; which was no better than to punish 'em for their *being afraid of sinning*. And if this be the *Discipline* which his Lp. complains of being *weakned*, I know of few moderate and wise Men that will be much troubled at it.

For the Practice of *Dissenters*,

1. He very groundlesly infers, *That because the Directory leaves it to the Ministers*, &c. *to determine how often this Institution shall be celebrated, that they exclude it by this Rule, from being an ordinary constant part of God's Service.* For no more can be justly drawn from those words, than that they left the matter to the liberty of those that had the oversight and care of particular Congregations. So that if any Ministers thought the constant celebration of this Sacrament every *Lords Day*, most convenient for the comfort and edification of their People, this Rule does by no means *forbid*, but rather *enforce* their doing it. But those indeed that think otherwise, are no farther impos'd on by this Rule, than to be oblig'd to do it *frequently*, which the *Directory* (as the Bp. owns) expresly requires; and I doubt not they intended by frequently, oftner than thrice a year. Nor can I imagine why he should any more compare *our* practice with the *Papists* than their *own*: For do the *Parish-Ministers* every Lord's-day *offer the Sacrament to the People*, or *invite 'em to it*, or *afford 'em opportunities for it*, any more than the *Dissenters*? Or rather do not the *Dissenters* generally afford 'em opportunities much oftner? Why should he then so severely condemn the *Dissen-*

ters for what they are leſs guilty of than *themſelves*? If he pretend that the Sacrament is *offer'd*, becauſe part of the *Communion-Service* is read; Does he not know that if the People take that for an Invitation, they'll find themſelves diſappointed? And ſure 'tis better to make no offer of it than a *deluſory* one.

2. He very confidently aſſerts, *That the Diſſenters rarely preſs the People to Communion; They have few Sermons or Diſcourſes to that purpoſe; And many of 'em condemn our Zeal for endeavouring to reſtore the conſtant Communion precedented in Scripture.*

'Tis ſtrange that his Lp. ſhould continually put us on ſo ungrateful a Task, as the denying the Truth of what he ſaith, by advancing ſuch groundleſs Accuſations; I am ſure the generality of 'em adminiſter this Sacrament far oftener than the generality of the Conforming Clergy; and 'tis ſeldom or never adminiſtred without their taking occaſion to preſs People to it. Nor do I find any of their Printed Diſcourſes on that ſubject, that omit their doing it: Nay, I am enclin'd to believe there are as many N. C. Writers as Conformiſts, that have preach'd and wrote for reſtoring the *conſtant Communion precedented in Scripture*. And one wou'd think that Experience ſhou'd be ſufficient to convince him that the *Diſſenting* Miniſters *preſs it more*. For of thoſe that attend the *Pariſh-Churches* and the *Meetings*, I think 'tis evident, that if we make allowance for the Numbers in general of thoſe of each Perſwaſion, the *Communions* of the Diſſenters will be found much more *numerous* as well as more *frequent*. I confeſs, if his Lp. only mean, That we do not *promiſcuouſly* urge *all People* to come to this Ordinance, how *ignorant* or *wicked* ſoever, 'tis true; and I hope he will not blame us for that, unleſs he think we may turn the Church into a *common ſink* and *receptacle* of profligate Sinners, and invite *Swine* to that H. Table. (For ſuch are all *notoriouſly vitious perſons* in the Language of the Scripture.) On the contrary, we have too great reaſon to complain, that too many ſuch are admitted in the Pariſh-Churches, notwithſtanding the ineffectual Proviſion of the *Rubrick* and *Canons*, againſt this *Abuſe*; of which no Reformation can be expected to any purpoſe, till particular *Paſtors* be reſtored to the due Exercise

ercise of their *Pastoral Power.* But for those that have *competent Knowledge*, and are of *Unblameable Deportment*, they are frequently urg'd to attend this *Institution*; and particularly in the *North* of *Ireland*, the Minister in visiting the several Districts, enquires of the Elders concerning such, that besides the general *Invitation* from the Pulpit, he may particularly urge 'em to their Duty.

3. For the *Practice* of *Dissenters*, he saith, *'Tis worse than their Principles*; and concerning it he adds these remarkable words:

I appeal to you, Whether it is not reckoned a great thing among many of you, if once in a year or two, a Communion be celebrated in one of your Meetings? Nay, among some of you 'tis often omitted for several years together, and in some places for ten or more. I fear I may say, Your People generally have too little sense of the Obligation of Receiving it at all; and your Ministers indulge 'em so far in this Corruption, that a man may live comfortably among you, and with the Reputation of a Professor, to Thirty or Forty years of Age, and never Receive at all. And by the best Enquiry I cou'd make, I cou'd not compute that above One in Ten that go to your Meetings, ever Receive through the whole Course of their Lives, notwithstanding Christs positive Command to do it in remembrance of him. So unhappily are Men overseen in laying aside the Commands of God for their own Inventions. I should be glad to find that I were mistaken in this Computation. In the mean time you must give me leave to tell you plainly, That this practice of rare or no Communion, is so peculiarly your own, that I think you are altogether singular in it; and are so far from having any Precedent for it in Scripture, that I doubt whether any Precedent can be found for you even among the most degenerate and barbarous People that ever call'd themselves Christians.

Answ. In order to our passing a right Judgment on this Accusation of the Bp's, I must give a brief Account of matter of Fact. For those *Meetings* in *England*, and the *South* of *Ireland*, where Pastors are settl'd, the most of 'em constantly celebrate the Lord's Supper *once a Month*, others *once in six Weeks, or two Months*, and a few *once every Lord's Day.* I do not believe there are Six that have it so seldom as *once a Quarter.* So that if the Bp. speak here of the gene-

generality of *Diſſenters*, (as we have reaſon to ſuppoſe, becauſe he does not here (as elſewhere) confine his Charge to any part of 'em) To reproach them as guilty of *rare or no Communion not to be precedented among the moſt degenerate and barbarous People that were ever called Chriſtians*, is a Calumny of ſuch a hainous nature, that I ſhall in meer Civility and reſpect to his Character, forbear to treat it as it deſerves; and ſhall only deſire him to bring the *Pariſh-Churches* to that *frequency of Communion* ſo generally practiſed among the *Diſſenters*, before he treat us any more with ſuch rude Language, as we might with ſo much advantage retort. If his Lordſhip pretend that he deſign'd to confine this to the *North* of *Ireland*, tho' he has expreſt no ſuch thing; yet how little ground he had for this heavy Charge, will appear upon a due Examination of matter of Fact: Of which I have this Account given by thoſe that know it much better than he can pretend to do.

'Tis ſo far from being true, that *'tis rare if once in a year or two a Communion be celebrated in their Meetings*, that it's univerſally uſual in every *Meeting* where an ordained Miniſter is ſettled, to have the Lord's Supper adminiſtred conſtantly *Once a year*, and *Twice* in the larger Towns. And what is more conſiderable, where-ever 'tis adminiſtred, 'tis uſual for *Two Thirds* of the Congregation to be *Strangers*. For 'tis their Cuſtom in the *North* to have very large and *numerous Communions*, ſo that when the Sacrament is adminiſtred in one *Meeting*, 'tis uſual for moſt of the Members of Neighbouring Pariſhes to frequent it: To which purpoſe they bring *Certificates* (or *Communicatory Letters*) from their own Miniſters. So that the generality of 'em (as I am aſſur'd) do *communicate four or five times in a year*; many of them do it *much oftner*; and all of 'em have the opportunity of doing it *ten, twelve, or fifteen times a year*, if they will take the Advantage of receiving it as often as 'tis adminiſtred within a few miles of their reſpective Habitations. And they alledge theſe two or three Reaſons that have induc'd 'em to this Method, 1. That hereby the vaſt Number of Communicants tends to increaſe the Solemnity of the Inſtitution, and repreſents in a more affecting manner the *Communion of Saints*. 2. That every *Pa-*

riſh

riſh having uſually but one Miniſter, 'tis requiſite the Miniſters of Neighbouring Pariſhes ſhould aſſiſt 'em on that occaſion; and conſequently they uſually bring their People along with 'em. 3. That the Miniſters of particular Congregations prepare their own people for it, by viſiting 'em round, examining every particular Member anew, about their ſpiritual Eſtate, and making due Enquiry about their Converſation; all which takes up a conſiderable time. This being a juſt account of their practice, tho' I muſt freely profeſs I do prefer the general practice of *Diſſenters* elſewhere, of adminiſtring the *Lord's Supper* in each *Congregation once a Month*, and cou'd heartily wiſh it were made a conſtant part of the *Lord's-day Worſhip*; yet I ſee not with what tolerable Juſtice the *Bp.* cou'd upbraid 'em with their *rare or no Communion*, when the Members of their *Meetings* do generally communicate much *oftner* than the Members of the *Pariſh-Churches*: Nay, when their Miniſters not celebrating it in each particular *Meeting*, is occaſion'd by ſo extraordinary care taken to prepare their People for it: Whereas there can be no other Account given why the Pariſh-Miniſters who take no ſuch pains with their People, adminiſter it ſo ſeldom, but either their *own Lazineſs*, or the *People's Indevotion*. And whereas he ſaith, *A man may live among 'em with the reputation of a Profeſſor, to Thirty or Forty Years, and never receive at all*; If he mean by a *Profeſſor*, a Perſon accounted truly *Religious*, they declare they know not of one Inſtance of that kind. And whereas he ſaith, *Not one in ten that go to their Meetings receive through the whole courſe of their Lives*, they do profeſs, that by the beſt computation they can make, there is not one in ten, or rather in 20 or 30, that *do not receive*, except ſuch as are with-held for want of *competent Knowledge*, or on the account of *Scandal*; and thoſe that communicate once, do it ordinarily on all following occaſions.

So that upon the whole, the *Bp.* is much more concern'd to find a *Precedent* for the generality of the Members of Pariſh-Churches in *their rare or no Communion*, than the *Diſſenters* are for the Members of their Congregations. And much more is he concern'd to find a *Precedent* for himſelf in his ſo rarely ſpeaking truth concerning the *Diſſenters*; and I fear that he will hardly find any (if I may re-

turn him his civil expressions) except among *the most degenerate and barbarous Writers that were ever called Christians*, I mean those *Romish Priests*, who in their writing against Protestants have acquir'd a peculiar dexterity in the practice of that Unchristian Maxim, *Calumniare fortiter, aliquid adhærebit, Throw dirt enough, and some of it will stick.*

REMARKS on the CONCLUSION.

1. FOr that part of it which contains his Lp's Advice to those of his own Clergy, I shall take no farther notice of it than as it concerns the *Dissenters.*

P. 166. He tells 'em, *They are never to despair whilst they have God's Truth on their side, tho' whole Provinces should fall off from the Church, as all they in* Asia *did from St.* Paul, 2 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Tho' none should believe our report, as it happened to our Saviour himself.*

Answ. This looks too like his former Language, when he so uncharitably excluded us from the Catholick Church: For does he indeed think that Men's going to the *Dissenters Meetings* is a *defection from Christianity, and turning Infidels to the Doctrine of the Gospel*, as the expressions he alludes to import? Since we agree in the Articles of Religion profest by the Establish'd Church (to which, by the way, the *Dissenters* of the two more strictly adhere); since (as himself owns, p. 4.) we agree about the inward part of Divine Worship; Nay, since we agree in the same external parts of it, *Praise, Prayer, Hearing* and the *Sacraments* of *Baptism* and *the Lord's Supper*; and only disagree about the mode of ordering those external Duties: Is it not most unreasonable, and contrary to Christian Charity, and I might add to common sence, to speak of such as in these Circumstantial Modes differ from him, as *fallen off from the Church, and dis-believing the Report of the Gospel*? What is this but to turn the *Circumstantial Modes of Worship* into *Fundamentals*, and thereby to turn the Reformed Church in this Kingdom into a *Sect* and *Party*, i. e. to incur the grossest sort of *Schism*, and most opposite to *Christian Love*? Hope I have in these Papers shewn our manner of performing these Duties to be more agreeable to Scriptural *Precept* and *Pattern*, and

yet

yet I wou'd sooner suffer my Right Hand to be cut off, than that any such Expression should drop from my Pen, that should thus confine the Church of Christ to the *Dissenters*, and censure others as *fallen off from it*. For I honour the *Parish Churches* as a very excellent part of the *Catholick Church*, and such as compar'd with the *Roman*, *Greek*, *Abissine*, &c. Churches, has attained to an excellent degree of Reformation.

P. 167, 168. He suggests to his Clergy, *That they cannot be supposed to be zealous in their Office out of any private Interest, or prospect of particular profit, because their Maintenance and Preferments are ascertained by Law, and depend not on the voluntary Contribution of the People*; and he insinuates on the other hand, *That the Dissenters are more liable to be acted by other Motives, since they must attain to Honour or Support by making or gaining a Party.*

Answ. If the *Dissenting* Ministers be acted in their *Nonconformity* by a Regard to Temporal Interest, they deserve to be begg'd for *Fools*. Does he think that upon their Conforming, they might not aspire to Ecclesiastical Dignities and Preferments as well as others, if their Judgments cou'd comply with all the *Declarations* and *Subscriptions* that are requir'd? How many cou'd I name him, no way inferiour to his Lp. in any Ministerial Abilities, who never had so much as 100 *l.* a year from their People, while he enjoys, by *common Report*, a *Bishoprick* worth 2000? Not that they *envy* him his *Wealth*, but they think it unreasonable he should *upbraid them* with their *Poverty*, as if it laid 'em under Temptations to *counteract their Judgments, to serve their Interest*, when if they cou'd have done so, they never needed to expose themselves to those Necessities. For it's plain that, quite contrary to what he suggests, the Temptation of Interest lies chiefly on the other side. What *Interest* can influence those Dissenting Ministers to *make* or *gain a Party*, who are sure to be *Losers* by their *adhering* to it, and have all possible prospect of *bettering* their Condition by *forsaking* it? And how much greater danger are those in of being influenc'd by it, whose excessive Preferments depend on their turning the *Church* into a *Party*, by keeping up narrow uncharitable terms of *Ministerial Communion*? And why should he think the Inferior Clergy may not be mov'd to be *zealous in their Office*,

Office, from a prospect of Interest and *Profit*? Does he think himself and his *Brethren* Immortal? May they *never* expect a Fall of Church-*Preferments*? Or are those *Preferments* so corruptly distributed, that no diligence of an inferior Clergy-man in his Office will signifie any thing to recommend him to 'em? Does Favour or *Bribes* so entirely prevail as to exclude all consideration of Merit? Either he reasons very weakly here, or else he insinuates what is very little to the credit of the Church.

P. 88. He does well to remind 'em, *that they are Ministers of the Gospel, not of a Party*. Answ. But why then does he speak of all that dissent from 'em, as *fallen from the Church*, and become *Infidels*?

He also in the same page justly speaks *of our differences as of little concern, comparatively with the common Interest of* Holiness *and Religion*: But when he tells us *of these differences being insisted on only as the occasions & Badges of those People who being resolved to separate themselves, are oblig'd to take up little differences for a distinction*: I would gladly know who are most chargeable with *taking up little Differences* to make 'em the *Distinguishing Badges of a Party*; They that arbitrarily impose such *Unnecessary Terms* of Ministerial and Christian Communion, as our Common Lord never requir'd, and so make their own dividing *Hedge* and *Enclosure* in his sacred *Vineyard*, or they that only scruple *compliance* with these suspected Terms, and desire that the Common Rule of *Christianity*, may be the only Rule of *Conformity*? They that on the account of these Differences cry up themselves alone as the Church, or they that plead only to be a part of it, or at most a more uncorrupted part? One wou'd think the former look more like persons resolv'd to separate themselves, especially when they contrive such Racks for mens Judgments and Consciences as the Act of *Uniformity* contains. And the latter cannot reasonably be supposed so obstinate, unless he imagine 'em fond of Poverty and Misery, and in love with Separation for its own sake.

P. 169. He suggests, *That while they have been defending their Common Christianity against Papists, Deists and Socinians, the Dissenters have taken that advantage to undermine 'em with their People, nay that some of 'em have even joyn'd with those Enemies to pull down their Constitution.*

Answ. I think it is apparent that the Dissenters have rarely wrote in defence of their own Cause, without being assaulted first. It was he first started the Controversie in this Kingdom, by excluding 'em from the Catholick Church. It is he has again renew'd it by a fresh Charge of our Worship having little of *God*'s immediate Appointment, but abundance of Humane Inventions. Now if we be guilty, 'tis indeed reasonable we should be silent; But if innocent, does he think our Reputation too inconsiderable to be worthy of a Defence against the most severe, and yet the most unrighteous Accusations? And if he did formerly with the same Sword attempt to stab his Popish Adversaries and his Dissenting Brethren, can he blame them for warding it off themselves, especially when at the same time they warded it off from the generality of the Reformed Churches, (whose Reputation he must have wounded through our sides) and directed the point of it more fully against the Papists.

But

But I would gladly know, who thoſe Diſſenters are that join'd with the *Papiſts*, *Deiſts*, and *Socinians*, in a Confederacy to pull down their Conſtitution. For I cannot imagine what ground he has for this Charge, unleſs he refers to the attempts made in the late King *James*'s time towards the Repeal of the Penal Laws and Teſt. And if he intend that, dos he not know, That there were far more of their Clergy, even the Dignitaries of their Church, that join'd in that deſign with the Court, then of Diſſenting Miniſters, of whom I could never hear of above One or Two concern'd, and even they had been both exaſperated by the barbarous Execution of thoſe Laws upon themſelves. And was it more criminal in them to attempt to burn the Rod that had ſo unmercifully laſh't 'em, then in thoſe to join in that deſign who had no other temptation then hope of Court-Favour and Preferment? Nay dos he not know that the Body of the Diſſenting Miniſters and People generouſly refus'd to concur in that deſign when earneſtly ſolicited to it; meerly becauſe they valu'd the general Intereſt of the Reformed Religion, before any ſeperate Intereſt of their own. And wou'd not a man of candour and ingenuity, have rather commended the carriage of the main body of 'em, then reproach't 'em with the faults of ſo few, (in which he knows they might recriminate with ſo much advantage) eſpecially when ſuch as reproach 'em were ſo acceſſary to thoſe faults by unchriſtian rigor and cruelty? And by the way, If by their *Conſtitution* he means our frame of Dioceſan Epiſcopacy and Government, why dos he ſuggeſt our concurrence with Papiſts to pull it down, when he knows well enough, if the Papiſts were in power, they would continue and uphold the ſame Conſtitution, and only change the Perſons.

II. *For that part of the Concluſion which is addreſt to the* Diſſenting Miniſters *of* Derry.

First, *I do fully concur with him in his Advice; Not to treat one another with ſcurrilous and unſeemly Reflections.* But I hope he will not account thoſe ſuch, wherein a Man is juſtly reprov'd for groſs Miſrepreſentations of other Men's Opinions and Practices, when he might eaſily have inform'd himſelf better; or a trifling Argument is not always treated with *grimace*, but ſometimes with the *ſlight* it deſerves.

Secondly, *I do alſo heartily concur with him in his requeſt to 'em, That they will not make the difference between us ſeem greater then really it is.*

And I hope he will find it punctually obſerv'd in theſe Remarks, in which I have ſo often diſclaim'd the Advantage given me by his own Principles to cenſure ſeveral practices in the Eſtabliſh't Church as unlawful. And therefore I hope I may, without offence, humbly requeſt his Lp. to take his own Advice; And truly if he had done ſo ſooner, he had ſpar'd me the ungrateful labour of theſe Remarks on his late Diſcourſe, which I hope may convince him, That the tendency of his whole Book is to make the difference between us ſeem greater then it is; partly by miſreporting our Principles and Practices, and partly by an unreaſonable charge of *human Inventions in the worſhip of God*, that has no other foundation, then either thoſe miſreports, or that neceſſary uſe of Chriſtian Prudence in determining ſome circumſtantial modes of Worſhip, which they make as well as we, and muſt be made in order to the Execution of God's own Commands relating to his Worſhip. Nay it ſeems to be the main purpoſe of his Diſcourſe to repreſent the Worſhip of Diſſenters, as ſo corrupted by human Inventions; that 'tis become vain and unacceptable to God; Which is a Cenſure that Charity forbids me to paſs on the Worſhip of the Eſtabliſht Church, tho I think I have prov'd that of the Diſſenters much more conformable to Evangelical

Precept

Precept and Pattern. For I doubt not a gracious God makes merciſull allowance for manifold culpable Imperfections, where the Worſhip is in the main agreable to his Word, and thoſe that offer it thro weakneſs diſcern 'em not. But I perceive 'tis far eaſier to give good Advice then to take it.

And for the particular Requeſts which his Lp. dos here in ſo friendly a manner, addreſs to the Diſſenting Miniſters of his Dioceſs, I ſhall take the liberty to interpoſe my ſingle Opinion. As.

1. I can freely concur with him in recommending that uſe of the Lord's Prayer, which as he juſtly obſerves, the *Directory* approves, becauſe I take it to be a very comprehenſive ſummary of the matter of Prayer delivered in the moſt accurate method and order. But then I muſt add, that as this uſe of it, in our publick Aſſemblies, is not with any certainty determin'd in Scripture, ſo 'tis a matter wherein good men may well exerciſe their mutual forbearance and charity.

2. I do as freely concur with him in deſiring 'em to endeavour the reforming that Irreverent practice, which too many of their Hearers ſeem to endulge themſelves too far in; *viz.* Of *Sitting* in the time of publick Prayer. 'Tis contrary to the general practiſe of their Brethern elſewhere, and I think of all the Reformed Churches, and what is more conſiderable very diſagreable to the Precepts and Examples propos'd in the Holy Scriptures. And I hope his Lp. will think the more open Irreverence, and Levity, too common in many Pariſh Churches to need as effectual Reformation.

3. I do alſo concur with him in deſiring 'em to adhere more ſtrictly to the Advice of the Directory, by more frequent celebration of the *Lord's Supper* in each particular Congregation.

For tho I am fully ſatisfi'd by their Accounts of matter of Fact, that their Members do ordinarily Communicate more frequently than thoſe of the Pariſh Churches; and that no one has the name of a Profeſſor among 'em that lives in the neglect of this duty, quite contrary to the *Bp's* ſuppoſition; yet I look on the practiſe of their Brethren in *England*, as in this particular, more conformable

to

to the rule of the Scriptures, among whom 'tis adminiſtred much oftner in each Congregation. For I think it highly probable, that it was in the Apoſtles time one conſtant part of the Lords day's Worſhip. I know this is not ſo practicable among 'em, while they take ſo extraordinary pains with the People every time they adminiſter this Ordinance to 'em. But I do not ſee any abſolute neceſſity of that: they may continue their ſtated particular Viſitations, without making 'em neceſſary to every Communion. And perhaps there may be too great a difference put between this and other parts of Divine Worſhip, by imagining that the frequent Celebration of it wou'd tend to leſſen the Reverence due to it. To all that are ſerious, the frequent Renewal of their Vows on the Memorials of a Crucified Saviour is the moſt likely and effectual means to keep their Souls under the conſtant awe of 'em. But the treating this Subject, as it deſerves, wou'd require a large Diſcourſe. I ſhall therefore only ſubjoin, That I hope his Lp. will take his own Advice, by endeavouring to have the Sacrament more frequently adminiſtred in the Pariſh Churches, and eſpecially that he will put his Clergy on imitating the Zeal and Diligence of the Diſſenting Miniſters, in their care to prepare their People for ſo ſolemn an Inſtitution, and to keep thoſe from it, whoſe open and notorious wickedneſs tends to infect others by the contagion of their Example, and to proſtitute the honour of Religion to the contempt of an Atheiſtical and Prophane Age.

4. For this Advice about Reading the Scriptures, I ſhall ſo far concur with him; that I wiſh the Rule of the Directory for reading One entire Chapter out of each Teſtament may be obſerv'd, when the ſhortneſs of the days will not leave room for Expoſition, without excluding that other way of reading parallel Texts, that occurs in what we call Preaching. But I muſt beg his Lp's pardon for preferring the Reading One Chapter with a clear Expoſition of it from parallel Texts to the bare Reading two, or three, or more, without it; notwithſtanding his ſo confidently obtruding upon us his former groundleſs Conceit, as if it were an undoubted Truth, *That 'tis a carnal and ſinful humour in the People to be fonder of Sermons and Lectures*

of

of human Compoſure, then of the pure Word of God in it's naked ſimplicity. For if he mean by it, *That 'tis a carnal and ſinful humour to be fonder of having the word of God read, explained, and applied, then barely read,* (as certainly he muſt if he ſpeak any thing here to the purpoſe.) This is (as I have already ſhewn him) no wiſer a conceit, then if he ſhou'd tell us, 'Tis a carnal and ſinful humour to be more affected with the word of God when we clearly underſtand it, then when we do not. And if ſo, why ſhou'd this ſinful humour of the People be indulg'd by preaching at all? Why ſhou'd any pains be taken to inform their Judgments by leading 'em into the true ſenſe of it? Or rather; why ſhou'd the Bp. ſo weakly oppoſe the purity and ſimplicity of the naked Word of God to a clear Expoſition of it? which us'd to be oppos'd only to the mixture of other doctrines that are either contrary to, or at leaſt not deliver'd in thoſe inſpired Writings. For tho Sermons and Lectures be in part of human Compoſure, yet ſuch as truly anſwer that Character, are nothing elſe but the naked and pure Word of God explained and enforc't upon the Conſciences of the People, without any mixture of foreign, or corrupt doctrines. For even in their Sermons themſelves, a great part of the time is ſpent by the People in conſulting and comparing various parts of the word of God. And if ſuch human Compoſures adulterate the ſimplicity of the Word of God, Why ſhou'd they not be excluded altogether, and the Clergy be turn'd into meer Readers? Or rather, may we not in ſuch confus'd and deceitful Reaſonings as theſe, ſuſpect a carnal humour in men's crying up the bare Reading the Word of God, to ſhift off the unwelcom Labour of Expounding it. And therefore I ſhou'd rather recommend the practiſe of the Diſſenters in their conſtant *Expounding* as well as *Reading*, to the imitation of the Conforming Clergy; And I wou'd particularly adviſe his Lp. not to ſpeak ſo ſlightly on all occaſions concerning Sermons, becauſe Preaching has hitherto been accounted the moſt valuable Talent that he is maſter of.

5. For his *5th.* Advice. 'Tis indeed true that many learned and ſober Non Conformiſts have judg'd occaſional Communion with the Pariſh-Churches in the ordinary Lords day worſhip lawful, and have

adviſed their People to practiſe it where they cou'd have no other opportunities of Publick Worſhip. Nay many of 'em have vindicated and practis'd ſuch occaſional Communion with 'em in the Lords Supper (tho I queſtion whether any of 'em fully approve it in reference to Baptiſm.) And tho I have no pretence to the firſt of the characters he gives ſuch Non-Conformiſts yet he will find the ſame charitable temper and practiſe recommended in the Reflections on his Anſwer to Dean *Manby*, *p.* 64. But methinks his Lp. ſhou'd, when he conſiders the truly chriſtian moderation of ſuch *Nonconformiſts*, reflect with ſome concern on his own uncharitable Principles towards 'em, in that *Diſcourſe* which he has never yet diſown'd. And it wou'd ſeem very unreaſonable in him to be too peremptory in demanding this from the *Diſſenters*, unleſs he wou'd expreſs equal charity on his part, and declare the *lawfulneſs of Communion with their Churches.* And ſince he cannot deny but that he has ſo fair Examples of *Catholick Charity* ſet before him, I hope he will follow 'em; For otherwiſe this *Requeſt* will appear on his ſide very *partial* and *unreaſonable.* And I hope this diſcourſe may convince him that we have no ſinful *human Inventions* among us to affright him from *Communion* with us; Much leſs do we make ſuch Inventions the *Conditions* of our *Communion* in any part of Gods inſtituted Worſhip. Nay ſince he ſo earneſtly urges our *occaſional Communion* with them, I wou'd deſire him to render it more practicable by removing that unhappy Bar to it which the *5th. Canon* of the *Church of Ireland* lays in our way. For by that *Canon* All are denoune'd *Excommunicated, who ſhall affirm and maintain that there are within this Realm other Meetings, Aſſemblys or Congregations, then ſuch as by the Laws of this Land are held & allow'd, which may rightly challenge to themſelves the name of true and lawful Churches*, and 'tis order'd that *ſuch be not reſtor'd till they repent and revoke their Error.* Now he knows we all affirm and maintain our Churches to be *true and lawful ones*, and therefore are by the *Canon Excomunicated.* Nor can we be without a plain violation of this *Canon readmitted* without retracting what we are ſo far from accounting an *Error*, that we think the contrary Opinion a very uncharitable one. So that to invite us to *Communi-*

on

on with 'em while this *Canon* ſtands in force againſt us, is but to *tantalize* us, and offer us with one hand what they withhold with the other. And there are but two ways to remove this obſtacle to our Communion with 'em, *viz.* either to diſcard that rigid and ſour *Canon*, or to procure an *Act of Indulgence*, and then our Aſſemblys being *allow'd* by the Law will not come within the reach of it.

6. For his Advice to the *Diſſenting Miniſters* of *Derry*, to *warn their People againſt ſuch Books as maintain principles contrary both to theirs and thoſe of the Eſtabliſh't Church*, ſince he is pleas'd to name one of my *own*, I am more particularly concern'd to conſider what dangerous *principles* it contains.

Now of the *principles* lay'd down in thoſe *Books*, and the *principles* common to him with the *Presbyt. Miniſters* in the *North*, to which they are contrary, his Lp. gives this Account; "You are ſenſible "that among thoſe Proteſtants that Diſſent from our Church, ſome "are *Congregational* and others *Presbyterians*, You of this Dioceſs "where I am concern'd, profeſs to be of this latter ſort, and agree "with us in owning, that by Chriſt's Appointment, the particular "Churches in convenient Diſtricts ought, according to Scripture-pre-"cedents to aſſociate under one Government, and theſe again to u-"nite themſelves into greater combinations of Provincial and Natio-"nal Churches; The difference between you and us, is concerning "theſe particular Diſtricts; Namely, Whether the Government of "'em ought to be in a Presbytery with a Biſhop, as Preſident and "Governor by Chriſt's Appointment, or in a Colledge of Presbyters "abſolutely equal. So then we both own National and Pro-"vincial Churches as well as ſingle Worſhiping Congregations; "But the Congregational Diſſenters deny, that Chriſt inſtituted any "other Church beſides a ſingle Congregation, and affirm that all o-"ther Churches, ſuch as Claſſical, Provincial, or National, are human "Inventions, and that every ſingle Congregation is independent, "and may indeed keep a fair Correſpondence with it's neighbouring "Congregations, but it is not under any common Government with "'em. Theſe laſt are the Avowed Principles of Mr. *Baxter*,

"Dr.

" Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Lob*, Mr. *Humphrys*, Mr. *Boyſe*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. " *Clerkſon*, and generally of all the late Defenders of the Diſſenters " Cauſe in *England* and *Ireland* that I have met with

Anſw. I muſt own my ſelf greatly oblig'd to his Lp. for giving me a place among ſo many excellent Perſons, for whom I have ſo great a Veneration. But I muſt beg his pardon if I think him a very unfit perſon to repreſent the *Principles* of others, who ſo ſeldom dos right to their Judgment when he goes about it. For I know none of thoſe Reverend Authors he has nam'd, that wou'd take this for either an accurate or juſt Account of their Sentiments in this matter; I am ſure neither Mr. *Baxter* nor Mr. *Humphreys* wou'd: And 'tis no way ingenuous in the Bp. to give us this confus'd ſtuff as Mr. *Baxters Principles* who has deliver'd his thoughts on this Subject ſo often and ſo largely, and with ſo admirable accuracy & clearneſs; So that I ſhall rather chooſe to refer the Reader to his many excellent Writings relating to this Subject of Church-Goverment, then to attempt to give any Abſtract of his Judgment from 'em. But for my own *Principles*, I know none I have yet avow'd but what are contain'd in the *Reflections* upon the Bp's. Anſwer to Dean *Manby*, having no where elſe deliver'd my Sentiments in reference to *Church Gouerment*; And for thoſe I appeal to the Reader whether the Bp. have done me any juſtice in his Repreſentation of 'em. And to that purpoſe I muſt beg the Readers pardon for tranſcribing thoſe Two paſſages in the *Reflections* which are the only places that relate to this purpoſe.

" *P:* 17 Particular Churches are the chief integrating parts of the " Church-Catholick. Theſe Churches conſiſts of one or more Paſtors, " and a Chriſtian Flock aſſociated under his or their overſight for perſo- " nal Communion in Faith, Worſhip, and Holy Living. Theſe Churches " are oblig'd by the very dictates of the Light of Nature, and general " Rules of the H. Scripture, to endeavour the preſervation of all neceſ- " ſary Unity by the amicable conſultations of their aſſociated Paſtors. " The judgment of ſuch aſſociated Paſtors ſhou'd be ſubmitted to by " the People under their care, when 'tis not repugnant to the Word of " God, and contrary to the Intereſt of Religion. But the people do

" not

" not owe 'em a blind obedience, nor have ſuch Paſtors any power but " for Edification. Much leſs can ſuch Biſhops pretend to a higher pow- " er, whoſe very office Chriſt never inſtituted, and whoſe pretended " Relation to their Dioceſs is not founded on the Peopl's conſent to " it. And if ſuch Biſhops ſhou'd claim the ſole power of Church " Government in a Nation, &c.

So *p.* 57, 58. Having there objected againſt the *Bp's.* Aſſertion, *That the ſupreme Government of our Church has always been in a National Council, or Convocation,* That Dr. *Stilling fleet* (now *Bp* of *Worceſter*) *durſt not own ſuch an Eccleſiaſtical Governing Head of the Church of England,* And that *neither the Light of Nature, nor general Laws of Scripture, wou'd ſuggeſt ſuch an Aſſembly* (*i. e.* one ſo choſen and conſtituted) *as the Governing Head of the Church of England,* I then add, " A duly elected Synod of Paſtors in a Nation, to " endeavour the neareſt unity and Concord of the particular Chur- " ches (as far as 'tis to be expected on Earth) by their amicable " Conſultations, we grant to be moſt deſirable and eligible wher- " ever it may be had. And the Judgment of ſuch a Synod ſhou'd " be comply'd with in all things not repugnant to the word of God. " But we cannot ſay ſo of an Aſſembly chiefly compos'd of Men, " whoſe Office is not only an Uſurpation, but ſuch as renders true " Church Government impoſſible, and whoſe Intereſt and grandure " inclines 'em to keep up the Diviſions and Corruptions which they " have made. And ſo ſuch a Convocations being entruſted by " Chriſt, with the National Church Government which Mr. *A.* " is pleaſed to aſſert, I oppoſe the judgment of the truly learned " Archbp. *Uſher* which he often proteſt to Mr. *Baxter*, *That Church Councills are not for Government, but for Unity*, *Not as being in order of Government over the ſeveral Biſhops, but that by Conſultation they may know their Duty more clearly, and by agreement maintain Unity, and to that end they were anciently celebrated.*

Since then this is all I have aſſerted in this matter, How comes the *Bp.* to ſay, 'Tis my *avowed Principle, That Chriſt inſtituted no other Church beſides a ſingle Congregation, and, that all other Churches, ſuch as Claſſical, Provincial. or National, are human Inventions and*

that every single Congregation is independent and may indeed keep a fair Correspondence with it's neighbouring Congregations, but it is not under any common Government with 'em, when there is not one of these *Propositions* in the *Reflections*; nay, when I am so far from *avowing* 'em that there is not one of 'em that I can assent to as here lay'd down by his Lp. And what Authority can he pretend to declare for me what my *avowed Principles* are? If he had any thing to say against the *Reflections*, he shou'd in common justice have quoted my *Words*, and given me leave to speak my own *Thoughts*; (as I have done by him in these *Remarks*) At least he shou'd not have obtruded upon me what I never *said* or *thought*. 'Tis none of my *Principle*, *That Christ instituted no other Church besides particular Congregations*. For I believe he instituted both the *Catholick Church*, and such *National* or *Kingdom Churches* (as that great Light of his Age, Mr. *Baxter* pleads for in his late Discourse on that Subject) *i. e.* a Society constituted of a Christian Sovereign Magistrate, and of Christian Subjects worshiping God ordinarily in true particular pastoral Churches, over which the foresaid Magistrate exercises a *coercive* Government *by the Sword*, as Pastors exercise a *Ministerial* one *by the Word*. I do also judg *Classical*, *Provincial*, and *National Synods* to be so far from being an *human Invention* in the common sense of the Word, *i. e.* a sinful or superstitious Invention of Men, that I think 'em highly agreable *to the Light of Nature* and the *general Rules of Scripture*, and have in the *Reflections* positively asserted: *that particular Churches are oblig'd to endeavour the preservation of Unity and Concord, by the amicable consultations of their associated Pastors*. I do not therefore *think any particular Church to be so independent*, as to be under no obligation to enter into such associations but the contrary. And to give him the true Account of this matter what I have asserted in those *Reflections*, is but the common Principles wherein both the *Presbyterian* and *Congregational* Divines are agreed, as he may see if he compare those Passages I have quoted, with the *Heads of Agreement* between 'em since drawn up. For in the *6th*. Head, there are these Three particulars lay'd down,

1. That

1. That in order to concord, *and in any other weighty and difficult Caſes, it is needful, and according to the mind of Chriſt, that the Miniſters of ſeveral Churches be conſulted and adviſed with about ſuch matters.*

2. *That ſuch Meetings may conſiſt of ſmaller or greater Numbers, as the matter ſhall require.*

3. *That particular Churches, their reſpective Elders and Members, ought to have a Reverential regard to their Judgment ſo given, and not diſſent therefrom without apparent grouuds from the Word of God.*

Theſe are *Propoſitions* of the ſame import with thoſe in the *Reflections*, and they are ſo far from being inconſiſtent with any *Principle* of thoſe call'd *Presbyterians*, that the moſt eminent of thoſe at *London*, have ſubſcrib'd 'em. 'Tis true indeed, the *Presbyterians* do aſſert more then this, and the *Aſſembly* of *Divines* in their *humble Advice concerning Church Government* have ſome Aſſertions, to which the *Congregational Divines* do not fully aſſent: But as to theſe *Differences*, as I have not in the foremention'd Book declar'd my own Judgment, ſo I know no right the Biſhop has to declare it for me, when he dos not know it. I have indeed quoted the Judgment of Archbiſhop *Uſher* concerning the *Antient Councils*, which he thought were not for *Government* but *Unity*, *&c.* And if he will on this account rank that Venerable *Primate* among the *Congregational Divines*, they will no doubt think themſelves greatly honour'd with his company. But for my own Thoughts, I ſhall freely ſubjoin, that I am greatly inclin'd to think, That the difference between thoſe that make *Synods*, only *Conſultative Meetings*, and thoſe that call 'em *Church Judicatories*, and aſcribe a *Governing Power* to 'em, is in a great meaſure rather verbal then real. For thoſe that make 'em *Church-Judicatories*, aſſign 'em only a *Miniſterial* and *Declarative Power*, and never imagin'd that the People ow'd a blind obedience to their determinations. And thoſe that make 'em only *Conſultative Meetings*

for

for preſervation of Concord, yet aſſert ſuch a deference due to their Judgment, *That it ſhou'd be complied with, both by particular Paſtors, and their Flocks, in all things not repugnant to the Word of God*: Nor do they deny that ſuch *Synods* may diſown ſuch particular Paſtors and their Flocks, as walk diſorderly, by rejecting their juſt and neceſſary Determinations, as no Members of their Aſſociation, or that they may entirely diſclaim Chriſtian Communion with thoſe particular Churches that perſiſt impenitently in maintaining ſuch corruptions in Doctrine and Worſhip, as directly ſtrike at the very Vitals and Eſſentials of the Chriſtian Religion. And I ſee not what thoſe can juſtly attribute to ſuch *Synods* more then this, who make 'em *Governing Aſſemblies*, or *Eccleſiaſtical Judicatories*. Nor do I know any great difficulty there is in moderate and wiſe men's joining in all the real uſe of ſuch *Synods*, in order to the preſervation of the Churches peace; notwithſtanding theſe different Names or Notions they affix to ſuch *Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies* and their *Determinations*: Of which more may occur when I conſider what his Lp. objects againſt the *Principles* he aſcribes to me.

On the other hand, The Biſhop has not truly ſtated the difference between the *Presbyterians* and *Prelatiſts*, when he tells us; *'Tis concerning theſe particular Diſtricts; namely, Whether the government over 'em ought to be in a Presbytery, with a Biſhop as Preſident and Governour, by Chriſt's appointment, or in a Colledg of Presbyters abſolutely equal?*

Anſw. Dos not his Lordſhip know, that our Modern *Prelates* not only pretend to a *diſtinct and ſuperior Office*, (and not meerly a *higher degree* in the ſame *Office*) but aſſume all *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* to themſelves? Do they not plainly exclude all *Presbyters* from any ſhare in it? Are not all *Church Cenſures* paſt by the *Chancellor*, ſolely in the *Biſhop's name*, without any concurrence of the *Presbyters* of the *Dioceſs*, who have no *voice* in 'em, nor are ſo much as *call'd* or *requir'd* to be preſent in the *Spiritual Court*? Nay If this be all that our *Prelates* pretend to, viz. *To be Preſidents in a Dioceſan Synod, in which the Presbyters of the Dioceſs ſhare in the Government*, How came they to reject Archbp. *Uſher's model of Epiſcopacy*, that allows

ſuch

ſuch a ſtated *Preſidency* to *Biſhops*, when this was offer'd by the *Divines* call'd *Presbyterians*, at the memorable *Savoy Conference*, as the ground of Accomodation? For tho thoſe *Divines* did not think ſuch a ſtated *Preſidency* of one *Perſon* of immediate *Divine Appointment*, yet they thought it ſuch a *prudential human Conſtitution* as they cou'd for peace ſake ſubmit to. But he knows the *Biſhops* rejected that Offer with ſcorn, nay would not ſtand to the *King's Declaration about Eccleſiaſtical Affairs*, that gave 'em much more of power then Archbp. *Vſhers model*. So that his Lp. ſeems not to underſtand the *Principles* of his *Brethern*, and I am beginning to hope is of more moderate Sentiments in this point then thoſe *Commiſſioners* at that *Treaty* were.

It remains only under this *Head*, that I conſider what he has to object againſt thoſe *Principles* of mine, as they are now truly cited from the *Reflections*. For I hope he dos not think me oblig'd to defend *Poſitions* that are none of my own.

" Now it is manifeſt (*ſaith he*) That theſe Principles of theirs-
" are much more different from your Principles then ours are: And
" the difference is much greater and more material. For it's poſſi-
" ble on your Principles and ours to preſerve *Unity*, and keep up
" ſome value for *Excommunication*, ſince he who is centur'd in
" one Church, cannot be received in another, neither with you,
" nor us, Whereas in the Congregational way, he that is Excommu-
" nicated in one *Congregation* may remove to another, or ſet up
" one for himſelf, if he pleaſes; At the worſt if he ſhou'd, it wou'd
" be counted but an Irregularity. Theſe Principles are deſtructive
" to the Peace and Unity of the Church, as well as to our common
" Cauſe.

Anſw. For the *Congregational* Divines I ſee no difficulty in clearing their Principles from theſe invidious conſequences he draws from 'em; for all of 'em aſſert that he who is juſtly Excommunicated in one Church ought to be receiv'd by no other whatever. But for my

own, which I am only here concern'd to defend, I wou'd deſire his Lp. to review his Arguments and tell me where the force of 'em lyes, What *Unity* of the Church are thoſe *Principles* lay'd down in the *Reflections* deſtructive of? Is it deſtructive to the Churches *Unity* to aſſert, *That the Light of Nature and general Rules of Scripture oblige the Paſtors of the Church to aſſociate for it's preſervation by their mutual Conſultations; And that the Judgment of ſuch aſſociated Paſtors ſhou'd be ſubmitted to whenever 'tis not repugnant to the Word of God?* Nor do I diſallow, but approve of *Aſſociations* in thoſe *leſſer* or *larger* Diſtricts, and the regular *Subordination* of the *leſſer* to the *greater*. What then can he find in my *Principles* deſtructive of the Churches *Unity*, unleſs he imagines it to be ſo, That I aſſert, *That the People do not owe a blind Obedience to ſuch Synods, and that ſuch aſſociated Paſtors have their power for Edification and not Deſtruction.* And dare he pretend the contrary? Dos not the *Church of England* declare, *That all Councills may err*, and will he aſſign an abſolute Authority in the Church to thoſe that are but *fallible?* Nay is not the pretence of the People's being *abſolutely oblig'd* to receive and ſubmit to the Deciſions of General *Synods*, the very foundation of *Popery*, and the chief ſource of all thoſe monſtrous corruptions in Doctrine and Worſhip which have been eſtabliſh't in it by the pretended deciſive Authority of ſuch *Councills*? Have not all thoſe *Councills* that have claim'd ſuch unlimited Authority been the fatal Engines of *Tearing* and *corrupting* the Chriſtian Church inſtead of preſerving it's *Purity* or *Peace?* As he may ſee prov'd with uncontrolable Evidence in Mr. *Baxters Hiſtory of Bp's and their Councills and in the defence of it.*

Again, How do theſe *Principles* of mine *hinder the keeping up a juſt value for Excommunication or any other cenſures of the Church?* For it no way follows from 'em *That he who is cenſur'd in one Church may remove to another, or ſet up one for himſelf if he pleaſes.* For he that is juſtly *cenſur'd* in one Church, ſhou'd not be receiv'd by any other whatſoever; And where the Paſtors of particular Churches are *aſſociated*, as I ſuppoſe they ought to be, this is always one neceſſary *Rule* for the preſervation of *Unity*. 'Tis true, If the perſon Excommu-

nicated

nicated complain of wrong done him, he may refer his Caſe to the Judgment of the *Claſſical* or *Provincial Synod* for redreſs of it. But if it appear that he is juſtly Excommunicated; For any other Paſtor to receive him, 'tis ſuch an irregular practiſe, as if perſiſted in may juſtify his Brethren in excluding him from being a Member of their *Aſſociation.* And for a juſtly Excommunicated Perſon to *ſet up a Congregation for himſelf,* is ſo hainous an Addition to the crime for which he was Excommunicated, that ſuch aſſociated Paſtors may juſtly warn the People againſt the danger of encouraging him in ſo impudent an Uiurpation of *Authority* in the Church, when he is not fit to be ſo much as a *Member* in it. Nor wou'd this *Uſurpation* of the ſacred Office by ſuch a juſtly Excommunicated Perſon be only an *irregularity* (if he means by that a diſorder that's culpable indeed, but yet tolerable, and inconſiderable.) For he is incapable of the Sacred Office, becauſe deſtitute of the qualifications neceſſary thereto, 1 *Tim.* 3.

So that upon the whole the *Biſhop* is groſly miſtaken in ſuppoſing that any *Principles* of mine are more different from thoſe of the *Presbyterians* then thoſe of the *Prelatiſts* are. For I have aſſerted none but what any *Presbyterian* will grant; tho they may aſſert more then my Subject then led me to: Whereas the *Principles* of thoſe *Prelatiſts*, that approve our preſent *Conſtitution*, are not only very different from *theirs*, but truly *leſſen the value of Excommunication*, and *render Church Diſcipline impracticable.* For what can more effectually *pour Contempt on the Cenſures of the Church*, then to have the moſt ſolemn of 'em, I mean *Excommunication*, decreed by a *Lay-Chancellor*, and what is worſe decreed uſually upon ſo frivolous cauſes, in ſo raſh and precipitant a manner, and made meerly an engine to ſqueeze the purſes of men, rather then reform their manners. And what can more effectually *render true Church Diſcipline impracticable* then for one man to engroſs the whole exerciſe of it in a large Dioceſs, containing many ſcore or hundred Churches, (whereas every Paſtor finds it a work hard enough to perform it right

right in his ſingle Congregation) and to exclude thoſe particular Paſtors entirely from it, to whoſe office it dos belong and without whoſe concurrence it can never be rightly adminiſtred.

I ſhall only add, That what any Conforming Divines have wrote, in *anſwer* to any *Principles* of mine, I know not. And for ſuch Books as Mr. *Baxter* has wrote in defence of the Non-Conformiſt's Cauſe, ſuch as his *Non-Conformity ſtated and argued*, and his *Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy*. If he think 'em *carefully anſwer'd*, I wiſh he would direct us to the *Anſwerers*: For I know of no ſuch *Anſwerers*, unleſs he take *railing* or *nibling* at Books to be *anſwering* 'em. But if he refers to the Debates between Mr. *Baxter* and Dr. *Stilling fleet*, and to the *vindication* of the latter againſt M. *Humfrey's* and Mr. *Baxter*, he may eaſily ſee how little that *vindication* ſignifies in the *firſt part* of Mr. *Baxter's Catholique Communion*, which is a *ſurvey* of the *Vindication*. And by the way, that judicious Divine was ſo far from entertaining Principles ſo deſtructive to thoſe of the Northern *Presbyterians*, (as the Biſhop here groundleſsly imagines) that he commends thoſe in *Scotland* for their *National Church-confederacy*, and the happy concord produc't by it. *Nation. Churches p.* 5.

6. For his laſt Requeſt to the *Presbyterian* Miniſters of his *Diocеſs*, *That they wou'd concur with him in beating down ſuch Vices and Immoralities as are oppoſite to our common Chriſtianity*; *ſuch as Adultery*, *Fornication*, *Blaſphemy*, *Profanatian of the Lord's day*, &c. I doubt not he'll find their moſt ready complyance, and have both their *hearts* and *hands* to concur with him in ſo neceſſary a work. And I may I think venture to aſſure him, they will receive no Perſons *Excommunicated* for ſuch *Vices* into their Congregations, nor give 'em the leaſt countenance. But I hope his Lordſhip will not reckon thoſe guilty of *Fornication* who are Married by Non-Conformiſt-Miniſters upon due publication of the Banes of Matrimony, nor expect that they ſhou'd reject their own Members, when the *Spiritul Courts* for want of other prey, on that ſcore draw 'em into their

their Churches, and bring 'em under their Lash. Nay as they have very little hope of any great *Reformation of manners*, from either the *Persons* that compose those Courts, or their *manner* of proceeding in 'em, both which they think greatly need to be reform'd, so I hope his Lordship dos not expect that they shou'd turn Informers to *bring Grist to their Mill.*

And if complying thus far with his Lordship's forementionʼd requests will contribute so much to his living more easily with the Dissenters, and to the taking off that uncharitableness which the differences that remain are apt to cause, I hope those of his Diocess will herein give him all the reasonable Satisfaction he can desire. And then I hope his Lordship will not continue the feud on his part, by putting such uncharitable Sour Covenants into his new Leases, as plainly imply his Intentions and endeavours to expel them, and suppress their meetings wherever his power and Interest can reach. For otherwise he will give 'em too great occasion to apply to these obliging expressions when compar'd with his Actions, that unhappy Remark, *The voyce is the voyce of Jacob, but the hands (those rough and hairy ones) are the hands of Esau.*

III. *For his Lordſhip's* Advice *to the* Conforming Laity *of* Derry.

I Shall take no farther notice of it, then to expreſs my great ſatisfaction,

1. *In his recommending to 'em the Worſhip of God in their Familys.* The general neglect of this has been one great ſource of the deplorable degeneracy and corruption of our Youth. And I heartily wiſh the *Clergy* were herein more exemplary to the *Laity*, by making their Houſes leſſer Churches and fruitful Seminarys of Religion. I hope the *Diſſenters* of that Dioceſs, as well as in other parts of the Kingdom, ſet 'em herein a Pattern worthy their imitation. But why his Lordſhip ſhou'd in their Family-Prayers ſeem to confine 'em to the words of the Church, I ſee no reaſon; unleſs he ſuppoſes thoſe *Forms* ſuch a Catholicon in *Devotion*, as ſome boaſt their *Recipe's* to be in Phyſick, that will ſuit all *particular Diſeaſes*.

2. *In his exhorting 'em not only to Innocency of life but to Chriſtian moderation too.*

For certainly when our Zeal, inſtead of being lay'd out to promote the great and important Intereſts of our common Chriſtianity, is chiefly ſpent about leſſer matters diſputable among truly good men, It turns into a præternatural and *feavouriſh heat* that *preys* on the *Vitals* of Religion. But I muſt add, That I underſtand not, Why *Innocency of Life and moderation* in the *Conforming Laity*, ſhou'd any more convince the Non Conformiſts of the *unreaſonableneſs of ſeperation from them*, then the like *Innocency and moderation* of the *Non Conformiſts* ſhou'd convince their *Conforming* brethren of the *unreaſonableneſs of ſeperation from them*. And no doubt but all good men on both ſides enjoy that *Communion of Saints* which our Creed ſpeaks of; And where their difference of Judgment about ſome modes of Worſhip,

Worship unavoydably occasions that difference of Practise (which some improperly call *difference of Communion*) yet there is no reason it shou'd disunite their Affections. They retain *Communion* in the Essentials of *Belief, Worship* and *Holiness* and are cemented by those common bands of Christian Unity mentioned, 4. Eph. 4, 5, 6. (*One Body, one Spirit, one Hope of their Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father*); And so far as they are acted by the genuine Spirit of Christianity they will endeavour to preserve *this Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*, by mutual *Forbearance* as to that *diversity* of external *Rites* and *Modes*, about which it cannot be Expected but that the different *apprehensions* of pious men will occasion *diversity* in their *practise*, especially where any *unnecessary* or *suspected Rites* are *imposed*.

IV. *For his* Advice *to the* Dissenting Laity *of* Derry.

I Shall only offer the following Remarks.

1: His Lp. dos well to refer 'em to their *Bibles* as I have also done in this Discourse, and I hope they will herein imitate those noble *Bereans* by examining what is said according to that unerring Standard and Test of Divine Truth.

2: That *Men are more fond of their own Inventions then of God's Commands* is a Truth that Experience puts out of all doubt.

But that all those Popish Corruptions of *Image-Worship, Prayers for the dead, Purgatory*, the *Intercession of Saints, Half Comunion, and Worshipping the Host*, were meerly, introduc't by the violent fondness of the People for 'em, against the will of the Church Governours who generally oppos'd and condemn'd 'em, is an *Observation* that I can see little ground for in *Church-History*. As to some of 'em, I think it far more probable that they had their rise either from the imprudent Zeal, or the politick Contrivance of the *Clergy* who found

found 'em Serviceable to squeeze the Purse as well as enslave the Consciences of the People. 'Tis certain that when these corruptions were once entertain'd, the *Clergy* were generally the most violent defenders of 'em, and the most cruel persecutors of all that made any Attempts towards Reformation.

But the Bp. applys this *Observation* to *Extemporary Prayers*, which as he supposes to be an *Human Invention*, so he tells us, "The "People have brought 'em into practise against the Opinion and "Constitution of the Church Governours, and of the first Reformers, "who all did settle Liturgys in the Churches which they reform'd; "This *Knox* did in *Scotland*, whose Liturgy we have ready to pro- "duce to the Conviction of those who pretend to be his Successors, "and yet condemn Forms of Prayer as unlawful. This *Luther* did "for *Germany*, and *Calvin* for *Geneva*, and for the *French-Church*, "whose *Liturgys* are still us'd by 'em.

Answ. I hope I have already sufficiently prov'd, That *Praying without Forms* is as much of Divine Institution as *Praying with 'em*, and consequently the Bishop has no more reason to call the one a *Human Invention* then the other. Nay, since there is not the least evidence of any stinted *Liturgy* prescrib'd or recommended to the Christian Church by Christ or his Apostles, but so strong presumption to the contrary; that in the Apostolical, and I may add in the two or three following Ages, even ordinary Pastors us'd *free-prayer*, or prayed in the exercise of their own Abilities; There is much more reason to rank such stinted *Liturgies* among the Bishop's sort of *Human Inventions*. For they have certainly neither *precept* nor *pattern* for 'em in the *New Testament*, as us'd in the Christian Church, and we do in the use of 'em vary from *Apostolical pattern*. And I take this account he has given us of the *Original* of what he calls *Extempore-Prayers* to be a very lame and untrue one. For if *free-prayer*, unconfin'd to a *stinted Liturgy* was the practice of the three first *Centuries*, (and Dr. *Comber's* proofs to the contrary are I think invalidated by his modest and learned *Examinator* to the full

full ſatisfaction of an unprejudic'd Reader.) Then the *Bp.* is firſt concerned to acquaint us how ſuch *ſtinted Liturgies* were brought into general uſe; And if he will take the Opinion of the learned *Capellus* in this matter, (even in that very *Diſputation* in which he ſo ſeverely cenſures the Compilers of the *Directory*) preſcribed Liturgies were unknown to the Apoſtolical and ſucceeding Ages, and were not introduc'd till thoſe Perſecutions ceas'd which kept alive the Zeal of the Primitive Chriſtians, and till through the favour of *Chriſtian Emperors*, the Number of Chriſtians *Encreas'd*, but the Fervour of true Piety and Devotion was *Allay'd*. And then they were gradually introduc'd for the uſe of *ſimple and unlearned Miniſters*; who through their *Sloth* were unfurniſh'd with Gifts, and through their *Ignorance* in danger of venting ſuch unſound Notions as ſubtile Hereticks might inſtill into 'em. †

But it was much later before ſtinted Liturgies came into general uſe, even in thoſe Ages (the Fifth, Sixth, *&c.*) in which the Clergy gradually degenerated into *Lazineſs* and *Ignorance*, as well as *Worldlineſs* and *Pride*, and true *Devotion* ſunk into *Formality* and *Superſtition*. And hereby the ruling part of the Clergy had the eaſier opportunity to propagate all their gainful Errors and Superſtitions among the People, by infuſing the poyſon of 'em into the Publick *Offices of Devotion*. For ſuch preſcribed *Liturgies* were firſt ſet up in *Patriarchal* and *Metropolitan* Churches, ſuch as *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Conſtantinople*, *&c.* And there was very great diverſity of 'em in the *Weſtern*, as well as *Eaſtern* Churches, for ſome Ages, till by the Artifices and Tyranny of the *Popes*, all or moſt of the *Weſtern* Churches were reduc'd to a Conformity herein to that of *Rome*, whoſe Publick *Offices* had frequent *Additions* to 'em, and *Changes* in 'em.

† *See Theſ. Sal. p.* 657.

And therefore 'tis no wonder that when our firſt *Reformers* began to oppoſe the Corruptions of *Popery*, they ſhould yet retain the uſe of *Liturgies*. For the *Clergy* were at that time ſo generally over-ſpread with deplorable *Ignorance*, that it was not to be expected that thoſe of 'em that embrac'd the Reformation ſhould be immediately qualify'd to *pray without Forms*, to which they had ne-

ver been accuſtomed. They were ſo far from being capable of that, that they were judged generally unfit to inſtruct the People, and therefore *Homilies* were compoſed for their uſe as well as *Liturgies*. But as when by the Revival and Increaſe of Learning, the *Clergy* generally acquir'd better Abilities, and ſo *Homilies* were gradually laid aſide, (the *ſtrong* having no more need of ſuch *Crutches*) ſo the ſame might have been expected in reference to *Prayer* as well as *Preaching*. And accordingly the *Diſſenters* in *England*, and the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, did gradually revive the practice of *praying without a ſtinted Liturgy*. And thoſe in *France* and *Holland* that retain ſome few ſhort *Forms*, yet leave their Miniſters at liberty to exerciſe their Gifts in *free-occaſional-Prayer*, and look on ſuch ſtinted *Liturgies* as exclude this Exerciſe of the Miniſters Abilities as too great an Encouragement to *Sloth* and *Ignorance* in 'em. Inſomuch as the foreſaid *Capellus*, when upon the like miſtake with our Author, he ſo ſharply chides the *N. C*'s in *England*, for condemning Forms of Prayer as *Unlawful*, yet does he warmly cenſure the rigour of ſuch as under pretence of certain and preſcribed Forms of *Liturgies*, ſtudy to baniſh out of the Church all uſe of *Prayers* conceived by particular *Miniſters Themſelves*, and diſowns this from being his Deſign.

So that the main Reaſon why our firſt Reformers retain'd *Liturgies*, does not extend to ſuch a ſtate of the Church wherein the Learning and Abilities of Miniſters are or ſhould be ſo improv'd as to ſet 'em as much above the need of ſtinted *Forms* of *Prayer*, as of *Preaching*. And accordingly, thoſe Churches whoſe Reformation was carried to the greateſt height, did not by any *Forms* of *Prayer* they retain'd (to expreſs their Concord in that Duty) exclude the uſe of *free-Prayer*. Nor do any *Diſſenters* condemn all publick uſe of *Forms*, but only ſuch as tempts *Miniſters* to a neglect of the *Gift of Prayer*, and hinders 'em from ſuiting all the Exigencies and Occaſions of their Flocks in that part of their *Publick Devotions*.

For the *Biſhop*'s Reaſon why the generality of the People are better pleas'd with *Extemporary Prayers*, than with ſuch Forms, *viz.*

* *Becauſe*

Becauſe the Novelty of the one gratifies more Men's carnal and itching Ears with a kind of ſenſual delight, and requires leſs pains to ſtrain up their Minds to true Devotion, *p.*184,185.——'Tis a very *confuſed* one, wherein there is ſomething of *Truth*, mixt with weak and cenſorious *Miſtakes*. 'Tis *true* indeed, that conſidering the general temper of Mankind, the *Variety* of *Matter*, as well as of *Expreſſion* in *free Prayer*, tends more to *raiſe Mens Devotion*, than the conſtant Repetition of the *ſame Forms*. Nor can the People ſo readily believe that a Miniſter prays from his heart, when he reads a *preſcribed Form*, as when he delivers a *free Prayer*, that is the reſult of his previous meditation. So that in this reſpect *free Prayer* has much the Advantage above *Forms*, that 'tis a greater *Help* to inward Devotion; which is ſufficient to recommend this mode of praying, as in general, far preferrable to the other. There is ſomething of Truth in thoſe Expreſſions of Sir *W. C.* * (tho' perhaps there is too much of the Air of a *Gentleman* in 'em) *When a Man qualify'd endu'd with Learning too, and adorn'd with a good Life, breaks out into a warm and well-deliver'd Prayer before a Sermon, it has the appearance of a Divine Rapture; He raiſes and leads the Hearts of the Aſſembly in another manner than the moſt compoſed and beſt ſtudied Forms can do. And the Pray-we's wou'd look like ſo many Statues, or Men of Straw in the Pulpit, compar'd with thoſe who ſpeak with ſo powerful Zeal, that men are tempted to believe Heaven it ſelf has directed their Words to 'em.* But why the *Bp.* ſhould make it a *carnal* temper in the People to deſire the beſt Helps that can be given 'em to excite their Devotions in Prayer, and cure their natural indiſpoſition to that Duty, I cannot conceive. It looks rather like a *carnal* temper in the *Clergy* to deny 'em this excellent *Help*, to indulge their own Sloth and Eaſe. Nor do I ſee why the People muſt be accus'd of *itching Ears*, becauſe they are prone to be more *dull* under the conſtant Repetition of the ſame *Forms*, than under the Variety of Matter and Expreſſion that occurs in *free Prayer*. He might as well upbraid 'em with *itching Ears* becauſe they wou'd be more *dull* in ſinging, if the ſame *Pſalm* and *Tune* were *conſtantly* uſed, than

* Character of a Whig and Tory, p.20.

than when *Variety* of both is allow'd 'em; or becauſe they wou'd be more *dull* if the ſame *Homilies* were conſtantly read, than under that more grateful variety of Inſtructions that *Sermons* contain.

But I wonder moſt why his Lordſhip ſhou'd in this reſpect *compare free Prayer to Images, and Relicks, and Mediatory Saints*, p. 185. unleſs he fancies that the uſe of *Images*, *Relicks*, and *Mediatory Saints*, does as much more contribute to raiſe true Devotion in the Worſhip of God, than the ſimplicity of his own Uncorrupted Inſtitutions; as the uſe of *free Prayer* contributes more to it than *ſtinted Forms*. And if he truly think ſo, the Papiſts are greatly obliged to his Lordſhip, for this favourable Character of the tendency and effects of theſe *Superſtitions*. But if his Lordſhip had duly conſider'd, that while *free-Prayer* continu'd in the Church, theſe *Superſtitions* were unknown in it, and that they were gradually introduc'd in the ſame Ages in which ſtinted *Liturgies* gradually came into general uſe, it might have prevented this *invidious* but groundleſs compariſon between the influence of *free Prayer*, and that of thoſe *groſs Corruptions*. I am ſure ſuch ſtinted Forms, when read out of a Book, look more like lifeleſs *Images* of Devotion, than thoſe *Prayers* that are the reſult of the ſerious Meditations and Affections of him that delivers 'em.

And *if the fondneſs of Ill People for any way of Devotion, be an Argument that 'tis not of God*, (as the *Biſhop* farther inſinuates, p. 185.) I am apt to think it will make much more againſt *ſtinted Liturgies*, than againſt *free Prayer*. For he will hardly be able to perſwade us that the *Debauchee's* of the Age dote on *Extempore Prayers* (as he calls 'em) and that the moſt *ſerious* and *religious* have the ſame violent paſſion for *preſcribed Forms*.

3. We muſt beg his Lordſhips pardon, if we cannot eaſily believe, *'tis only Conſcience that makes the Conforming Clergy ſo generally decline Extemporary Prayers*. For if by *Extempore Prayers*, he

he means such as are *free* and *unconfin'd* to any prescribed *Forms*, he seems himself to own, *p.* 54. That there are *some occasions that require it even in publick*, p. 54. and I see no ground to doubt but that they are ordinarily more *convenient* then set *Forms*, if those Prayers be most *convenient* that tend most to raise true Devotion in the minds of the People.

But we must much more beg his Lp's pardon for not believing what he adds for Confirmation of this account of their disusing *free Prayer*. For it seems a very surprizing Discovery that he has made to us, when he tells us, *p.* 186. *'Tis manifest that Extemporary Prayers wou'd be much more easy to most of us, and less burthensom then the service we use. You may think otherwise, but assure your selves that you are mistaken. And I dare appeal to those that have tried both, whether is most easie. There are such, both amongst you and us, that have made the experiment. And I dare refer it to 'em to declare on their Consciences which of the two Services they look on to be the greater burthen to him that performs 'em. Whatever you may think if we wou'd indulg our selves, It were no hard matter for the meanest of us to pass an Extemporary Prayer on our Auditory, or turn the heads of our Sermon into one.*

Ans. We pay a great deference to his Lp's Judgment, but we cannot, without offering great violence to our own understandings, bring 'em to assent to so incredible a *Paradox*, meerly because 'tis deliver'd with so extraordinary an *Air of assurance*; much less can we entertain that as a *manifest* Truth, which to us seems so contrary to common sense. For we cannot imagine what unsupportable *burthen* it shou'd be for a man to read the *Service* of the *Church* when he has the *Book* before him; unless when he is *pain'd with sore eyes*; or *terribly hoarse with a great Cold*; For then it may possibly be some considerable *Trouble* to him. But for a Minister to deliver a *free Prayer* in a Publick Assembly (And the Bp. knows the *Dissenters* are seldom accused for theirs being too *short*) requires both serious *Meditation* before hand to suit it to the occasion, and to the state of

his People, and the *Laborious Exerciſe* of his *Judgment*, his *Invention* and *Memory*, which is a real *burthen* and *difficulty* to thoſe that are not by deep Study and frequent Exerciſe habituated to it. Nay tho the *Diſſenters* ſhou'd Pray in that new way his Lp. has contriv'd for 'em, by *patching* together ſeveral pieces of *old Forms* to make a new dreſs of it, yet this wou'd require ſome Exerciſe of their *Judgment* and *Memory*, to *tack* 'em right together, and to repeat 'em without heſitation. And this ſure is not ſo eaſie a matter as what he cannot deny every School-boy to be capable of, *viz.* to turn over the leaves and Read what is uſually in a fair and large Print. His Lp. may if he pleaſe, appeal from common ſenſe to *Experience*; but by all that I have yet convers'd with on this Subject, his aſſertion ſeems as ſtrange to them as it does to us. Nor can I meet with any of theſe *Vertuoſo*'s in Devotion, that pretend upon any *Experiments* they have made, to give their ſuffrage to his *new Obſervation*. We do not indeed doubt of his Lp's Abilities, but he muſt allow us to doubt of thoſe of the body of the inferior *Clergy*, who I fear wou'd think it a ſevere impoſition upon 'em, if their *Dioceſans* ſhou'd oblige 'em to the frequent Exerciſe of their Talents this way. For I have heard ſeveral *Clergy-men* of no mean parts, complain of the unhappy inability for *free Prayer*, that general diſuſe had brought upon 'em, and I believe I might herein with much better reaſon appeal to Experience. But ſince his Lp's hand is in for *Paradoxes*, I think he ſhou'd have added one more, *viz.* *That 'tis manifeſt that 'tis a far greater burden for the Clergy to Read the Homilies of the Church, or other Mens Sermons, than to Preach Sermons of their own*; and I doubt not he may with as much reaſon appeal to the *Experience* of thoſe that have tried both, to atteſt the Truth of it. And if he can make good the Truth of theſe two *Paradoxes*, the *N.C.* Miniſters will hence forward paſs for *lazy Drones*, while the poor Readers of the Church are accounted the trueſt *Labourers*. But to give the latter their due, the moſt of 'em take too much pains for that ſorry *hire* that's allow'd 'em by ſuch of their Brethren as are *laborious* enough to engroſs Church-Livings, but too far conſult their eaſe to make the Duties of their Function any *burthen* to 'em.

Laſtly,

Lastly, For his Request to the Dissenting Laiety, *That they won'd believe he heartily desires and studies the good of their Souls*, I hope they are willing to gratify him herein as far as rational Charity can allow. Only it wou'd greatly facilitate their *Belief* of it, if they found him more tender of their *good Name* and *just Reputation*; And they are sory to find that notwithstanding all his professions of good-will, he shou'd shew so little regard to that, not only in a continued Series of unjust Accusations through his whole Book, but especially in the following words, in which he has drawn up a comprehensive Summary charge, sufficient to render 'em odious if it be believ'd, but they are confident too apparently groundless to gain credit with any that will pass a Righteous and Impartial Judgement on these matters.

His Lp's words are. "For how is it possible that any Man that "has a Zeal for the Purity of God's worship, shou'd not have his "Spirit mov'd within him, to see a well-meaning People so "strangely mis-led, as to content themselves to meet together "perhaps for some years with a design to worship God, and yet "hardly ever see any thing of God's Immediate Appointment in "their Meetings? Now to my thoughts this is manifestly the "case of many of you, since a Man may frequent some Meetings "among you for some years, and never hear a Prayer, a Psalm or "Chapter, which has been imediately dictated by God, and never "be call'd on to bow his knee to God, or see either Minister or "People Address themselves to him in that humble posture; "Lastly, never see any body offer to Administer, or desire to Re-"ceive the Food of Life in the Lord's Supper. These are me-"lancholy Reflections to me, who believe that God has re-"quir'd these in his Worship; And therefore I hope you will "take it in good part that I Endeavour to Restore them to "you.

Anf. If the Case of the *Dissenters* be truly such as the Bp. Repre-sents it, His Zeal to recover the Purity of Divine Worship among 'em,

'em, is highly commendable; and wou'd deſerve their thankful acknowledgments. But if the whole of this heavy Charge be ſo far from being *manifeſtly true*, that 'tis rather *apparently groundleſs and unjuſt*; There will be ſome occaſion to ſuſpect, that his Lordſhips Zeal has more of *heat* then *light* in it, and is but the *Zeal* of a *Party*, that often tranſports Men beyond all bounds of Truth, when 'tis their deſign to render thoſe odious whom they account their Adverſaries. And whether this charge be not ſo apparently groundleſs and unjuſt will appear upon the Review of it.

For do the Diſſenters *content themſelves to meet together for ſome years, and yet hardly ever ſee any thing of God's immediate Appointment among 'em*, when they have every Lords-day *Prayer*, *Praiſe*, *Reading*, and *Expounding*, and *Applying* the Word of God, and frequently *Baptiſm* and the *Lords-Supper*, which are all Duties of *God's immediate Appointment*? Or can he tell us of any other parts of Divine Worſhip beſides theſe, that are inſtituted by God? But his Lordſhip perhaps does not ſpeak ſo much of theſe *parts* of Divine worſhip themſelves, as of the *manner* of performing 'em. For when he comes to make good his charge, he tells us, *A Man may frequent your Meeting ſome years, and never hear a Prayer, a Pſalm, or a Chapter which has been immediatly dictated by God &c.* But why does he charge the Diſſenters for never uſing a *Prayer immediately dictated by God*? If he ſpeak of *PſalmPrayers*, what he ſaith is notoriouſly untrue.

If he ſpeak of *Proſe-Prayers*, why does he make it our Crime to uſe no ſuch *Prayers immediately dictated by God*, when he cannot produce any ſhaddow of proof of any ſuch *Prayers immediatly dictated by God*, for the uſe of the Chriſtian Church, unleſs the *Lords Prayer*? Nor is there any clear Evidence of its being dictated as a *Form* to be uſed in our Publick Aſſemblies: Or does he think their *Collects* any more *immediatly dictated by God*, than our *free Prayers* are? I hope he may from the foregoing Diſcourſe find, that the latter are more agreeable to the *Precepts* of the *New Teſtament*, and much more to the *Pattern* of the Apoſtolick Church, than *ſtinted Liturgies*.

Again.

Again why dos he tell us, that the Diſſenters may in ſeveral years never hear a *Pſalm immediately dictated by God?* When *Pſalms* are conſtantly ſung in their *Meetings* much more than in the *Pariſh-Churches.* And can he find any other *uſe* of 'em preſcrib'd to the Chriſtian Church? (except that of their being *read for inſtruction*, as they are among us equally with other parts of the *Old Teſtament*). Or is he ſo weak as to imagin that a *Proſe Verſion* of the *Pſalms* is *immediatly dictated by God*, but a *Metre-verſion* is not; when God has *immediatly dictated* neither, and when the true ſenſe of the original is as much the *word of God*, when in *metre* as when in *proſe*? Again, why ſhou'd he tell us of our not hearing *a Chapter immedialy dictated by God*, when he never *immediatly dictated* any ſuch diviſion of the Scriptures into *Chapters* at all, nay when an *entire portion* of Scripture, and uſually a whole *Chapter*, and ſometimes more, is ſo conſtantly *read* and *expounded*, beſides the *reading* ſo many parallel Texts to explain and urge ſome doctrine or precept of the Chriſtian Religion? (*i.e.* when the Scriptures are *read* all the ſeveral ways we have any pattern for in the Chriſtian Church?) Again, why dos he make it a Crime that we do not *bow our knees to God*, when we either uſe that poſture, or that other of *ſtanding*, which is as much a *ſcriptural* poſture, and equally expreſſive of our religious *reverence* in all our immediate addreſſes to God? Again why ſhou'd he accuſe thoſe as *never ſeeing one offering to adminiſter, or deſiring to receive the food of life in the Lord's-Supper*, who (tho they communicate ſeldomer than other *Diſſenters*, yet) ordinarily do it oftner then the *Conforming Laity* in moſt parts of the Kingdom? One wou'd think his Lp. might have ſpar'd 'em the labour of ſo obvious and eaſie an Apology, by forbearing ſuch accuſations as have not ſo much as an appearance of *Truth* or *Juſtice*. But if he cannot perceive things that are ſo clear and plain, the Diſſenters will, in requital of his prayer for 'em, beg of God, *that he may open the eyes of his underſtanding*; And they hope when thoſe ſcales are fallen off, (I mean thoſe unhappy prejudices that hinder him from diſcerning theſe things in their true light,) then theſe *melancholly reflections* will quickly vaniſh, with which

his mind has been ſo much diſturb'd on this occaſion. For now, if he pleaſe, he may clearly ſee the *Diſſenters enjoy already all thoſe divine Appointments which he is ſo ſollicitous to reſtore to 'em*, and (whatever others do) free from any mixture of ſinful *human Inventions*.

And as they thank him for his endeavour to inſtruct 'em, ſo they humbly requeſt he wou'd calmly and impartially conſider what is here offer'd for their neceſſary vindication; Which if he do, they do not deſpair, but it may recover him to a more favourable opinion of his Brethren, and a more charitable temper towards 'em; and may oblige him, as an evidence thereof, not only to retract his former uncharitable *excluſion of 'em from the Catholick Church*, but this ſuper-added injury, in *charging their Worſhip with human Inventions*, and ſo frequently *miſrepreſenting* their *opinions* and *practices* contrary to plain evidence, in order to the countenancing that groundleſs Accuſation. For ſuch *Juſtice* and *Charity* towards our Fellow-Chriſtians, is moſt becoming thoſe that profeſs to expect that great day when the *univerſal Shepherd* will appear, and call both *Paſtors* and their *Flocks* to a ſtrict account at that general and final *Viſitation*.

Appen-

APPENDIX.

To the *Remarks* I have already made on the *Biſhop's* Diſcourſe, I think it neceſſary to ſubjoyn theſe two *Additional* ones.

I. *THat his Lordſhip has omitted one material part of Divine Worſhip, about the manner of performing which, the Conteſt between the Eſtabliſht Church and the Diſſenters dos moſt directly concern this charge of human Inventions in the Worſhip of God.*

For of thoſe two *Sacraments* which are the two parts of poſitive inſtituted Worſhip peculiar to the Chriſtian Religion, he has only conſider'd that of the *Lord's-Supper*, but has ſaid nothing concerning the other, which is as undoubted a part of Divine Worſhip, and the very Sacrament of our initiation into the Chriſtian Church, *viz. Baptiſm.* I confeſs his *prudence* and *foreſight* ſeems very commendable in this wary ſilence and omiſſion. (For 'tis eaſier to anſwer ſuch objections as he himſelf makes for the *Diſſenters*, than thoſe they make for themſelves) But I cannot ſo much commend his *candour* and *ingenuity* in it. For he cou'd not be ignorant that here the *Diſſenters* particularly us'd to fix their charge of *human Inventions in the Worſhip of God*, which the Bp. has been ſo far from endeavouring to clear their *way* of adm'niſtring this Ordinance from, that he has rather furniſht us with an invin-

invincible argument *ad hominem* to make it good. There are two things which the *Diſſenters* object againſt the way of celebrating this part of Divine Worſhip in the Eſtabliſht Church; The *one* is the *uſe of the Croſs as a dedicating ſign*; The *other* is, *the making God-fathers and Godmothers Sponſors for the religious Education of thoſe children whoſe Parents are living, to the excluſion of the Parents themſelves.*

Now let us examin each of theſe *Practices* by the Bp's own *Principle*. *Thoſe ways of Worſhip* (ſaith he, p. 3) *are diſpleaſing to God which are not expreſly contain'd in the holy Scriptures, or warranted by the examples of holy men therein.* But neither of theſe *ways* of celebrating *Baptiſm* can plead any ſuch expreſs *command*, or ſo much as *example* in the holy Scriptures; none that I know of, having ſo much as pretended to produce either for 'em. So that unleſs the Bp. retract his own *Principle*, he muſt diſcard both theſe practices as *ſinful human Inventions*. But as I lay no great ſtreſs on an argument founded on ſo ambiguous a *Principle*, ſo I ſhall add, That I fear theſe two things will prove *human Inventions*, according to the juſter notion of 'em given in the *Remarks* on the *Introduction*.

For the *Croſs in Baptiſm*, I ſee not how it can be clear'd from being a *New human Sacrament*. For there wants nothing but *Divine Inſtitution* to make it as much a *Sacrament* as *Baptiſm* it ſelf. For what more can be requir'd to the nature of ſuch a *Sacrament* of the *New Covenant*, in reference to both the parts of it, than to be a *viſible ſign*, whereby *God's promiſe of the bleſſings of that Covenant is confirmed to us*, and *we brought under ſolemn obligation to the dutys of it*. For if ſuch an *external ſign* be appointed by *God* for theſe *ends*, 'tis a *Divine Sacrament*; If by *Men*, 'tis a *Human Sacrament*, or a part of poſitive Worſhip of *human Invention*. Now that the *Eſtabliſht Church* has appointed this viſible ſign of the *Croſs* for both theſe purpoſes I mention'd before, is, I think, ſufficiently evident from her own expreſs declaration concerning it. For theſe are her words in the 30*th Canon* of the Church of *England*.

The

" The Holy Ghoſt by the mouth of the Apoſtle did honour the " name of the Croſs ſo far, that under it he comprehended not " only Chriſt crucified, but the force, effect and merit of his death " and paſſion, with all the comforts, fruits and promiſes which " we receive or expect thereby. —And afterwards, —the Church " of *England* hath retained ſtill the ſign of it in Baptiſm, following " therein the Primitive and Apoſtolical Churches, and accounting " it a lawful outward Ceremony, and honourable Badg, where- " by the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him that died on the " Croſs, as by the words of the Common-prayer-book may appear. The words in the Service-book, to which the *Canons* refer, are alſo theſe; " We receive this child into the Congregation of " Chriſt's Flock, and do ſign him with the Sign of the Croſs, " in token that he ſhall not be aſham'd to confeſs the Faith of " Chriſt crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner, againſt " Sin, the World, and the Devil, and to continue Chriſt's faithful " Souldier and Servant to his lives end.

Here is the *Sign of the Croſs* ſet up to repreſent *Chriſt crucified, and all the comforts, fruits and promiſes which we receive or expect as the force, effect and merit of his death and paſſion.* And ſure Baptiſm can repreſent no more to be either *receiv'd* or *expected* by us. 'Tis alſo advanc't as an *honourable Badg, by which the perſon Baptiz'd is dedicated to the ſervice of him that died on the Croſs,* and conſequently brought under ſolemn obligation to all the dutys of the New Covenant, *to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner againſt Sin, the World, and the Devil, and to continue Chriſt's faithful Souldier and Servant to his live's end*; And what more peculiar *dutys* of the Covenant of Grace can *Baptiſm* oblige us to?

Nay, as thoſe *Sacraments* of Divine Inſtitution are intended by their *ſignification* to excite us to our duty by way of moral cauſality, or influence, ſo the ſame is aſcrib'd to this Ceremony a-among the reſt appointed by the *Eſtabliſht Church, that 'tis apt to ſtir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God*

by such a notable and spiritual signification, whereby he may be edified. See Pref. to the Cerem.

So that *Crossing* in *Baptism* is as much a *Sacrament* as any thing can be that is not divinely instituted, *i. e.* 'Tis a *Sacrament* which men have presum'd to Institute to the *like* purpose, and use as our Blessed Saviour has Instituted *Baptism* it self.

Nor do any of those Excuses I have yet met with, signifie any thing to take off this charge.

We are sometimes told, *That Baptism is perfect without it:* See the 30*th* Canon.

Answ. Not to insist on what might be justly said, that the *Canon* enjoyns the use of it in *Baptism*; And that a great part of the *Office* of *Baptism* is continued after the *crossing* is over, which seem to imply the quite contrary to what the *excuse* insinuates; I do not see that this signifies any thing to remove our *Objection*. For *Baptism* is perfect without the *Lord's-Supper*, and yet that's a distinct *Sacrament*, and so will *crossing* prove no less a *human Sacrament*, tho it were administred in publick worship at a different time from that of *Baptism*. Only it looks the more presumptuous to joyn it with *Baptism*, as if we wou'd supply our Lord's defects in that Institution which he has made the initiating symbol and badg of our Christian Profession.

We are also told, *That the Minister Baptizes in the name of Christ, but Signs with the Sign of the Cross in the name of the Church, who by that Rite receives the Infant into the number of her particular members.*

Answ. I might content my self with replying, That there is no such thing suggested in the *Office* of *Baptism*, nor in the *Canon* that relates to the *Cross*. The words us'd by the Minister when he *crosses* the child, rather relate to it's being receiv'd into the universal Church, *For that's the Congregation of Christ's Flock*; nor is there the least syllable in the words following, of the person Baptized being *sign'd with the sign of the Cross*, in token of his *being received into*

to this National Church. But I add, 'Tis no way true that the *Croſs* is only us'd as a *rite*, by which the *Eſtabliſht Church* admits the Baptiz'd into the number of her *members*; For the *36th Canon* expreſly aſſerts it to be *an honourable badg, whereby the perſon Baptiz'd is dedicated to the ſervice of him that died on the Croſs*, and refers to the words of the *Common-Prayer-Book*, which are plain to that purpoſe. And therefore the difficulty ſtill remains, By what Authority the Church can appoint Miniſters in her name to dedicate men to the ſervice of a crucified Saviour, by a *Rite* or *Ceremony* of their *own*, when Chriſt has already appointed *one* of *his own* chooſing for that *end* and *purpoſe?* For if ſhe cou'd, why do we quarrel with the *Roman Church* for adding ſo many new *Sacraments* to thoſe two which Chriſt has Inſtituted already? Nay, why do we blame the *Romiſh Church* for their additional rites, of *oyl*, and *ſalt*, and *ſpittle*, and annexing ſuch ſpiritual ſignification and uſe to 'em?

And 'tis yet more inexcuſable to make ſuch a *human Invention* a neceſſary condition of Chriſtian *Communion* in this part of the Worſhip of God. For that is to deny men the benefit of *God's Inſtitution*, to which all credible Profeſſors of the Chriſtian Religion, and their poſterity, have a right, by the charter of our common Lord, becauſe they dare not comply with a meer *human Invention*, for which there is as little (if not leſs) to be ſaid, than for any of thoſe other rites practis'd by the Roman Church in the celebration of this Ordinance. And for the cuſtom of *Croſsing* themſelves in common converſation, practis'd by the Primitive *Chriſtians*, to diſtinguiſh themſelves from *Infidels*, we ſee not what pretence it can afford, for this *Religious* uſe of the *Croſs*, as a dedicating ſign in the publick worſhip of God, eſpecially as conjoyn'd with his own, *viz. Baptiſm.*

For the *uſe of God-fathers and God-mothers, as excluſive of the Parents publick promiſe of the religious Education of their children*, there are theſe two objections lye againſt it.

1. When

1. When the *6th Canon* of the *Church* of *Ireland* ordains, *that no Parent ſhall be urg'd to be preſent, nor admitted to ſtand as God-father for his own Child*, it plainly diſcharges the Parents from any publick engagement to a duty which God has moſt expreſly enjoyn'd 'em, *6 Deut. 6, 7. 6 Eph. 4.* And can any thing be more unreaſonable, than to forbid them to bind themſelves by a ſolemn *publick promiſe* to a duty, which God has ſo ſtrictly bound 'em to by his *own Authority*, when one great deſign of *Baptiſm*, wherein we dedicate our ſelves, or our offſpring to God, is to bring us and them under ſuch external *publick bonds* to the *dutys* of God's Covenant.

2. *God-fathers* and *God-mothers* abſolutely undertake a work that dos not belong to 'em, unleſs upon ſuppoſition of the Parents dying, and their adopting the child. And what is far worſe, hereby the generality of ſuch *Sponſors* are commonly involv'd in the guilt of heinous perjury, by undertaking *poſitively* to do that *themſelves*, which not one of many ever performs. For beſides their Vowing in the child's name, *to renounce the Devil and all his works, &c. To believe the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and obediently to keep God's holy Commands.* (As if ſuch actual Faith and Repentance were requiſite to the claim of Infants, to the promiſes of God's Covenant, and the Seal of 'em). They are alſo told by the Prieſt, what is their part and duty in purſuance of their promiſe, viz. "To ſee that the Infant be taught, ſo ſoon as "he ſhall be able to learn, what ſolemn vow, promiſe and pro-"feſſion he has made by them; they are to call upon him to hear "Sermons, and chiefly to provide that he may learn the Creed, "the Lord's-Prayer and ten Commandments in the vulgar "Tongue, and all other things which a Chriſtian ought to know "and believe to his ſoul's health; and that the child may be "vertuouſly brought up to lead a godly and a chriſtian life, *&c.* Now we may ſafely herein appeal to common experience, how few make any more of this than a matter of meer *Ceremony* and *Form*. And alas, how few that ſeriouſly conſider how hard it is

to

to discharge these dutys aright for their *own* children, would willingly entangle themselves in such solemn engagements, to do all this for *other men's*. And yet *Parents* must have their children excluded from *Baptism*, if they cannot prevail with others to enter into such unreasonable and rash *Vows*, in which, the most only trifle with the Almighty God, and dissemble with men in so awful a transaction.

If indeed either these Sponsors were only engag'd *conditionally* to take care of the child's holy education in *case* of the Parent's dying, or were only made *witnesses* of the *credibility* of the Parent's profession of Christianity, as some wou'd pretend to salve the matter, There were somerhing to be said as an excuse for this practice. But 'tis evident from what I have already quoted, that they enter into a solemn promise of all the dutys forementiond.

I might have objected farther, that the 14th *Canon* of the Church of *Ireland* forbids the Minister *to refuse or delay to Christen any child brought to him on Sundays or Holy-days*, without any exception, whereas he shou'd in all reason enquire, whether the Parent be a *Professed Christian*, unless it be suppos'd that the children of *professed Infidels* have a right to this mark of God's Covenant.

II. *The Bishop has taken no notice of human Inventions in the Discipline of the Church, about which he knows the Contest between the Established Church and the Dissenters chiefly lyes.*

I speak not here of any *lawful determinations* of *human prudence* that relate to the exercise of that *sacred discipline* that *Christ* has instituted, but of *sinful corruptions* of it, by *instituting such new Officers* in the *Church* without any *warrant*, as deprive his undoubted *Officers* of part of that Pastoral power he has invested 'em with, and render true Church-government impracticable; and by variety of *Canons* and *Constitutions*, not only unknown to the Scripture, but contrary to the *Rules* there laid down for the preservation of *order*, *unity* and *peace* in the Church. But since his Lp's discourse dos not lead me to enter on the particular examination of this

subject, and he may find these matters largely treated, in Mr. *Baxter's Treatise of Episcopacy*, the *Terms of Christian Concord*, the *Search for the English Schismatick*, and the *Case of Non-conformity stated and argued*. I shall not, without greater occasion, engage my self in a Controversy I have so little fondness for, and expect so little good from any polemical debates about. Only, since his Lp. is pleas'd to request several things from the *Dissenting Ministers* of *Derry*, relating to their *Discipline* as well as *Worship*, in order to the facilitating an Accommodation, and begetting a more amicable correspondence; I hope his Lp. cannot take it amiss, if we use the like freedom, in offering, with all humility, the following Requests to our *Reverend Conforming Brethren*, especially *those* whose Authority renders 'em most capable to promote the Reformation desir'd in 'em.

1. Since, as we humbly conceive, it was the most generally receiv'd Opinion of the first Reformers in *England*, in *K. Henry the 8th's*, *K. Edward the 6th's*, and of the *Conforming Divines* in *Q. Elizabeth's Reigns*, that a *Bishop* and *Presbyter* differ only in *degree*, not in *Order* or *Office*, (as Mr. *Humphreys* has largely prov'd in a late Book called the *Healing Attempt*). We wou'd humbly desire 'em to use their interest, that that unhappy Clause may be ras't out of the *Preface* to the present *Book of Ordination*, in which 'tis so peremptorily asserted, [*That 'tis evident to all men diligently reading the H. Scriptures, and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these three Orders in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.*] That by three *Orders* they mean three *Offices*, is plain from the very following words, *which Offices were evermore had in such Reverend Estimation, &c.* Now it seems to us very unreasonable that all Ministers shou'd be by the *Act of Uniformity* oblig'd to profess their *Assent* to this *proposition*, when 'tis so contrary to the current judgment of the generality of the most Eminent *Protestant* Conforming Divines in those 3 forementioned *Reigns*, (to whom we might add several very learned ones in the Reign of K. *James* the *first*, and K. *Charles the first and 2d*), but especially when 'tis a Proposition at

best

best disputable, both among learned *Protestants* and *Papists*; and, as far as we can judg, rather evidently *contrary to the holy Scriptures*, and to the *first and purest ages of Christianity*. So that we fear that few Ministers can sincerely profess their *Assent* to this Assertion, who have taken the pains to make any impartial enquiry into this matter. And we are the more desirous of having this *Clause* ras't out, because this new Opinion of *Episcopacy* being a distinct *Order* and *Office* from *Presbytery*, is the ground of that uncharitable practice of the *Establisht Church*, in requiring *Reordination* in all such *at home*, as have been ordained by *Presbyters*, (*i.e.* true *Scriptural Bishops* and *Pastors*) as a necessary *condition* of being admitted to the exercise of their Ministerial Function, nay in urging *Reordination* too on all the Ministers of *Reformed Churches abroad*, who never had *Diocesan* Bishops among 'em. As if all the administrations of those Eminent Ministers in *France*, who are now so honourable *Confessors* in the cause of Reformed Christianity, were mere *Nullitys* till *Prelatical* Hands were laid upon 'em.

2. Since the *Archbishops* and *Bishops* claim the *Government* of the Church as their *Province*, we humbly wish they wou'd endeavour to recover the spiritual part of their *Authority* out of their *Chancellor's* hands, who have so long usurpt the *keys of sacred Discipline*, and have hitherto so scandalously manag'd 'em, as to bring the solemn *censures* of the Church into general *contempt*. And no wonder, when they are prostituted to so vile a purpose as that of *filthy lucre*, and thereby the *Temple* of God is turn'd into a *House of Merchandize*. We do not speak this against the power of the *Spiritual Courts* in those *Civil* Causes, or in those *Ecclesiastical* ones which their *Majesties* in pursuance of their just power *circa sacra*, may authorize 'em to determine; but only their assuming the cognizance of all cases of *scandal*, so far as they subject men to the *censures* of the Church, and being entrusted with the *infliction* of those *censures* even in reference to all the numerous *causes* that come before 'em, so few of which properly belong to an *Ecclesiastical Judicatory*. For besides that, we think,

That

That the power of inflicting those censures belongs to *Pastors*, and cannot be delegated by 'em to a *Layman*, it seems a certain and unavoidable, tho pernicious consequence of such *Spiritual Courts* being entrusted with the sentence of *Excommunication*, to enforce all their *Decrees*, that the most *awful judgment on earth* is like (to use my Ld *Baton's* expressions) to be made *an ordinary process to lacquey up and down for fees**. We doubt not their Lp's have read Bp *Bedel's* Life wrote by the present Bp. of *Sarum*, wherein there is so loud and just a *complaint* of the gross abuses of this kind, and so noble an *example* set 'em of zeal for the Reformation of 'em. And no doubt, if they wou'd concur in their imitation of it, they might do it with rational prospect of greater success; and be happily instrumental to wipe off some part of that *stain* brought on the Church by her tolerating these corruptions, which (as the forementionʼd Bp of *Sarum* relates) pious *Archbishop Usher* so greatly lamented, and *apprehended it wou'd bring a curse and ruine upon the whole Constitution.* See Bp *Bedel's* Life, p. 86, 87.

**Consider: for the better establishing the Ch. of Engl.*

3. We cou'd heartily wish that when their Lp's have recover'd their own Authority out of their *Chancellors* hands, they wou'd exercise it in concurrence with the *Presbyters* of their several *Dioceses.*

And herein also the forementionʼd Bp. *Bedel* set 'em an excellent pattern, *lb. p.* 90. And we hope the Bp of *Derry* will urge 'em to an imitation thereof, since he has laid it down as their common Opinion and Judgment, *p* 175. *That the Government of the Church in such districts as those of our Dioceses, ought to be in a Presbytery with a Bishop, as President and Governour by Christ's Appointment.*

4. We wou'd also humbly desire 'em to restore that *Godly discipline* which the Common-prayer-book tells us was in the *primitive Church*, for bringing such as were *convicted of notorious sin, to publick*

publick profeſſion of their Repentance. For ſince the *Church* in the *Office* of *Commination*, yearly declares, that the *Reſtoration of the ſaid Diſcipline is much to be wiſh't*, It will look like a mocking of Heaven, yearly to repeat ſuch lazy wiſhes of it, when there are no ſerious attempts made towards it; And we can ſeee no reaſon why the *Curſes* peculiar to the *Moſaical* Diſpenſation, ſhou'd be ſubſtituted inſtead of it.

5. We cou'd wiſh that part of the *Office* for *Viſiting the Sick* might be review'd, which concerns *Abſolution*.

For ſince there is no other *Abſolution* own'd in the Reformed Churches, but either *publiſhing the conditional offers of pardon in the Goſpel*, or *a miniſterial releaſing thoſe from the Cenſures of the Church, on whom they had been inflicted before.* We think it dos too much countenance the *judicial* power of *Abſolution* claim'd by the *Romiſh Prieſts*, for the Miniſter to *abſolve* the *uncenſur'd* in ſo peremptory terms; *I abſolve thee from all thy ſins, in the name of the Father, &c.* For they ſeem to make the Miniſter paſs a more *poſitive judgment* of the ſick man's *Repentance*, than he is capable to do.

6. In order to the more effectual exerciſe of that *godly diſcipline* forementiion'd, We wou'd earneſtly requeſt that the Pariſh-Miniſters may be reſtor'd to that *Paſtoral* power which Archbiſhop *Uſher* in his *model of Epiſcopacy* ſhews that they were inveſted in according to the former Book of *Ordination*; but of which they ſeem now depriv'd, by the many changes made in the new. 'Tis certain they are moſt capable of a *perſonal* inſpection of the lives of their Flock, and conſequently of enquiring into any ſcandalous miſcarriages among 'em, and ſuiting their admonitions to the caſe of ſuch Offenders, and judging whether there be, or be not, a credible profeſſion of Repentance made by 'em. Nor can there be any danger of their abuſing that ſacred cenſure of Excommunication, by being too raſh in it; for that danger is fully

See the Healing Attempt, p. 57, 58, 59, &c.

obviated by the method propos'd in the forementiond model of AB *Uſher*, which refers the *decreeing* that ſentence to the monthly *Synod* of the Miniſters in that Precinct, or part of the Dioceſs, of which the *Suffragan* or *Chorepiſcopus* is the *Moderator*. In the mean time, we cou'd wiſh that Pariſh-Miniſters were more effectually urg'd to obſerve the 20*th Canon*, which charges 'em *not to admit to the holy Communion any of their Cure or Flock, which be openly known to live in notorious ſin without Repentance*, tho we can expect no very conſiderable effects of ſuch a temporary ſuſpenſion, when it obliges the Miniſter to turn *Informer* againſt ſuch Offenders in the *Spiritual Court*, where they are ſure to be put to great charges; by which method he is but like to alienate their hearts from him, and fruſtrate the ſucceſs of all thoſe admonitions, by which he ſhou'd endeavour to recover 'em to Repentance.

7. They wou'd farther humbly deſire, that ſome more effectual care may be taken for the tryal of thoſe that are to be admitted into *Holy Orders*.

For the 32*d Canon* enjoyns the *Biſhop to examin 'em in the preſence of thoſe Miniſters that ſhall aſsiſt at the Impoſition of hands*, or at leaſt *take care that thoſe Miniſters ſhall examin them*; yet we underſtand this is too often put off to an *Archdeacon*, or one of his *Chaplains*, and at beſt but too *ſuperficially* perform'd. And we humbly conceive the *Canon* it ſelf is very *defective*, in not recommending ſuch *particular Tryals* as are fit for ſuch *Candidates* of the Miniſterial Function to undergo in order to their giving a ſufficient ſpecimen of their proficiency in the *ſtudy* of *Divinity*, and in the *knowledge* of the *holy Scriptures*. And herein we wou'd humbly recommend to 'em the excellent method propos'd by the *Weſtminſter-Aſſembly* in their *Propoſitions relating to Church-Government and Ordination, viz.* "That ſuch Candidates be ex-
"amin'd touching their skill in the Original Languages, by Read-
"ing the Hebrew and Greek Teſtaments, and rendring ſome por-
"tion of 'em into Latin. They are to be examin'd alſo, what
"Authors in Divinity they have read, and trial ſhall be made of
"their

"their knowledge of the grounds of Religion, and ability to "defend the Orthodox Doctrine in 'em against all unsound and "erroneous Opinions, especially those of the present Age; of "their skill and sense in the meaning of such places of Scripture "as shall be propos'd to 'em, in cases of Conscience, and in the "chronology of the Scripture, and in the Ecclesiastical History. "They are to expound some difficult place of Scripture; they "are to frame a discourse in Latin upon some common-place or "controversy in Divinity, and maintain a Dispute upon it; and "they are to Preach a practical Sermon before the people, those "concern'd in their Ordination being present."

This *method* is so exactly follow'd among the *Dissenters*, that those they *ordain* commonly pass twice thro these Tryals, both when they are *first* allow'd to *Preach* as *Candidates*, and at their *Ordination*. And as 'tis the most *effectual* that can be propos'd for preventing an *ignorant* and *insufficient* Ministry, so 'tis the more requisite that the like care shou'd be taken in the *Establisht Church*, where so many are tempted to croud into the Sacred Office by the lure of secular interest; and so many Parents, from the prospect of preferment thrust those of their Children upon the service of the Church, whom they are at a loss how to dispose otherwise of.

8. We cou'd heartily desire some more effectual course were taken for the *Reformation* of such of the *Clergy*, whose scandalous lives stain the honour of their profession.

For the infectious examples of such *Clergymen* are far more powerful to spread the contagion of wickedness and vice among their Flock, than their doctrine to propagate piety and holiness. And 'tis no wonder, that either the *offerings* of the *Lord* are *abhorr'd* by the people, when they see 'em presented by so *unhallow'd* hands, or that they run without restraint into all excess of Riot, when they do but herein follow their spiritual Guides. 'Tis great pitty therefore that the 42*d Canon* which threatens such scandalous Clergymen with *Ecclesiastical censures*, is not more faithfully execu-

executed. And it seems unaccountable, why it shou'd not as expressly order the *suspension* and *deposition* of such as are found incorrigible, as other *Canons* of the *Church* of *England* order their *suspension* and *deposition* for no greater faults, than *Omitting the use of any form of Prayer, or any other Rite or Ceremony prescrib'd by the Service-Book*, or *appointing* or *keeping Fasts either in publick* or in private houses without the Bp's leave. For this is to lay greater stress on the *Churches Injunctions*, than on *God's commands*; and to punish *non-conformity* to the former, more strictly than *disobedience* to the *latter*. We shall only add, that if the Law of *Moses* so carefully provided that its Priests shou'd have no *blemish* or *deformity* on their *bodys*, sure much greater care shou'd be taken, that those who serve at the Christian *Altar*, shou'd not be persons of *deformed* souls, and of a *tainted* conversation. And we are heartily glad, that their Majesties, by their *Royal Commission*, have begun so necessary a work in this Kingdom, as the purging the Church from such *scandalous* Clergymen, as have too long been the *blemishes* of their holy profession, and hope it may extend to all other parts where there is the like necessity for it, as there appears to have been in the *Diocess* of *Down* and *Connor*.

9. They wou'd also earnestly desire that so gross a *corruption* as that of *Pluralitys* and *Non-Residence* so universally complain'd of, may be at last effectually *reform'd*.

In order whereto, they desire it may be seriously consider'd, whether our *Canons* themselves do not rather *confirm* than *reform* these Abuses. For by the 36*th Canon* every *Master of Arts*, that is a *publick and sufficient Preacher*, is capable of *Pluralitys*. The *Time* which he that enjoys 'em is to *reside* in each of his *Benefices*, is not determin'd. And by the 41 *Canon* of the *Church of England*, I find no other *bounds* set to the number of *Benefices*, than that they must not be more than *thirty miles* asunder. And tho every such *Pluralist* be requir'd to have under him in the *Benefices* where he dos not reside, a *lawful and sufficient Preacher*; yet it is both unreasonable in it self, that such a *sufficient Preacher* shou'd

ſhou'd ſacrifice his painful labours to pamper the avarice and eaſe of another; And 'tis too notorious, that ſuch *Pluraliſts*, for the moſt part, give ſo deſpicable and ſtingy allowance to their poor *Curates*, that it cannot reaſonably be expected, any man of tolerable abilitys ſhou'd be contented with it; and ſo to feed the covetous humour of ſuch mercenary Paſtors (as the *Council of Trent* it ſelf calls *Pluraliſts*) their Flocks muſt be betrayd, by being committed to the care of ſuch, whom their ignorance renders the Reproach of their profeſſion, and who indeed are fit for no other ſort of *Preaching*, than this *new* one the Bp. of *Derry* has found out, *viz. The Reading a Chapter out of the Bible.* Nor do we think the *Canons* about the Clergy's *Reſidence* leſs exceptionable. For the 37*th Canon* ſuppoſes ſome perſons to be *Benefic't* that are not allow'd to be *Preachers* (tho, contrary to the foreſaid Bp's notion, they are allow'd by the Engliſh *Canons*, to *read plainly and aptly, without glozing, or adding*, both the *Scripture* and *Homilys*). And of theſe *Incumbents* that are *unlicenſt to Preach*, no more is requir'd, than that they procure Sermons to be *Preach't once a month in their Cures*, and that too, *if the Living will bear it.* And the ſame *Canon* only requires every *Benefic't* man that is *licenſt*, to provide for the *Benefice* he *reſides* not on, a *Preaching Curat*, on the ſame *condition* that the worth of the Benefice will bear it. As if the *ſouls* of the people were of ſo little value, that they muſt rather periſh for lack of knowledg and inſtruction, than ſuch a *Pluraliſt's* avarice be croſt by reſigning the *Benefice* to one that will take care of the people's ſouls, provided he may enjoy the Stipend the Law has aſſign'd for the encouragement and ſubſiſtence of ſuch a one.

10. They wou'd humbly deſire that the Bp's wou'd uſe their intereſt and endeavours, that the rigor of the *Act of Uniformity* may be abated, in its requiring ſo expreſs a *Declaration* from every Miniſter of his *Aſſent and Conſent to all things contain'd in, and preſcrib'd by the Book of Common-Prayer, and the form and manner of making and ordaining Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons.* For as far

we can judge, there are many things in thoſe Books, which the more judicious and charitable of our *Conforming* Brethren do not heartily *aſſent* and *conſent* to, but wiſh the *alteration* of; And therefore ſuch cannot *make* the ſaid *Declaration* without doing it in in ſo lax a ſenſe as too much countenances *Equivocation* in ſuch important matters as theſe are.

11. They wou'd alſo earneſtly entreat their *Conforming* Brethren to uſe their endeavors to reſtore to their *people* that *right* of *chooſing their own Miniſters*, which the *Canons* of ſo many *Councils* celebrated in the pureſt ages of Chriſtianity have ſo fully and frequently *confirm'd* to 'em; At leaſt, we wou'd deſire that ſome effectual proviſion may be made againſt *Paſtors* being impos'd on 'em without their own *conſent*. For we wou'd not in this requeſt entrench on the power of *Patrons* any farther, than to deſire it may be rendred conſiſtent with this undoubted *priviledg* and *right* of the *people*, which no human Laws can juſtly deprive 'em of. For ſince the people have ſouls, whoſe welfare ſo greatly depends on the helps and advantages that a judicious and ſerious Miniſtry dos furniſh 'em with to promote it, 'tis moſt reaſonable that their *Votes* and *Suffrage* ſhou'd be allow'd in the choice of the perſon, to whoſe Paſtoral care they entruſt the conduct of 'em. If it wou'd be a very unjuſt thing to impoſe *Phyſitians*, *Lawyers* or *Tutors* on others, where far leſſer intereſts are concern'd, how much more unjuſt were it for the people to have their Salvation ſo far put into the *Patrons* hands, as to be oblig'd to acquieſce in whomſoever they preſent, tho the choice be never ſo apparently prejudicial to their *eternal intereſt*. A *negative voice* is the leaſt that can in this caſe be allow'd to the *people*, unleſs the *Patron* that preſents were to be *reſponſible* for their ſouls at the day of Judgment, or cou'd ſecure 'em from all the pernicious effects that an ill choice is attended with to their irreparable loſs and detriment.

12. We

12. We wou'd alſo humbly requeſt, that that *incapacity for Communion* with the *Eſtabliſht Church* may be taken off, which their own *Canons* lay the *Diſſenters* under.

There has been occaſion given already in this Diſcourſe, to take notice of one of 'em, *viz.* the 5*th.* which *excommunicates ipſo facto* all *that ſhall affirm, or maintain, that there are within this Realm, other Meetings, Aſſemblys, or Congregations, than ſuch as by the Laws of this Land are held and allow'd, which may rightly challenge to themſelves the name of true and lawful Churches.* And ſure they cannot expect we ſhou'd forbear to vindicate our own *Innocence*, to eſcape this unjuſt *cenſure*; or that we ſhou'd voluntarily *condemn* ſo many *Excellent Churches* to avoid the *Condemnation* of this uncharitable *Canon.* But our *Incapacity for communion* with 'em is encreaſt by the 3*d Canon*, which alſo *Excommunicates ipſo facto not only all that ſhall preach, but all that ſhall by other open words declare or ſpeak any thing in derogation, or deſpiſing of the Service Book, or any thing contained therein.* For we cannot poſſibly give to our *Brethren* any account of our *diſſent* from 'em either in *writing* or *private converſation*, without *ſpeaking open words* in *derogation from ſome thing contain'd in the Service-book.* We cannot complain of the uſe of the *Croſs*, or of that ſort of *Sponſors* in *Baptiſm* which the *Service book* requires; nor blame thoſe uncharitable *Rubrics* that debar the moſt ſerious Chriſtians from thoſe *Sacraments* that do but ſcruple *croſsing*, *ſponſors*, and *kneeling*; we cannot mention any of thoſe numerous defects in the *Liturgy* contain'd in the *Exceptions* given in at the *Savoy*-conference, without coming under the terrible ſentence of this *Canon.* In a word, we muſt either never *ſpeak* our judgment concerning that *Book*, tho our own neceſſary *Vindication* never ſo apparently *require* it; Or if we do, we are as far as the power of that unmerciful *Canon* can reach, *Excomunicated, i.e.* in the language of the Eſtabliſht Church, in her form of Excommuication, *cut off, as dead members, from the body of Chriſt.* Again, we are *Excommunicated*, if we

affirm

affirm any of the 39 Articles to be in any part such as we cannot with a good Conscience subscribe to, tho 'tis known we cannot subscribe to the *Disciplinary* ones, tho in *England* they have already done it to the *Doctrinal* ones. And that our business may be yet more effectually done, We are again *excommunicated by the 4th Canon*, if we *affirm, that those who are consecrated according to the Rites of the Ordination-Book, are not lawfully made, nor ought to be accounted either, Bishops, or Deacons*; (*i. e.* If this *Canon* speak of *Scriptural Bishops* or *Deacons*) For 'tis sufficiently known, we neither account the Office of a modern *Diocesan Bishop*, nor that of a *Deacon* in the sense of the *Establisht Church*, to be either of 'em of *Divine Institution*.

Now we think it most reasonable, that those who so often urge us to their *Communion*, shou'd remove such insuperable *Obstacles* out of our way. And we humbly conceive there is that apparent *absurdity* and *uncharitableness* in these *Canons*, that will justify our desire of their being *discarded*.

1. They are in our judgment guilty of an *apparent Absurdity*; For we are *Excommunicated* by 'em without any other *Admonition* of our fault, than what the *Canons* themselves give us. Whereas 'tis not meerly the committing an Offence, that justly subjects men to that terrible censure, but persisting *impenitently* in it, according to our Blessed *Saviour's* known Rule, 18 *Matth.* 15, 16, *&c.* So that the *Church* in these *Canons* uses greater *severity* than our *Lord* himself, who in his judgment will not condemn men meerly for their *sins*, but for final *obstinacy* in 'em. And indeed, if these *Canons* be just, we are bound in conscience, as knowing our selves *Excommunicate*, to abstain from the *Communion* of the *Establisht Church*, till we have *revok't these Errors*, as the *Canon* calls our Opinion and Judgment in these matters. Now we think it very hard for men to be thus peremptorily *cut off* from *Christ* without any *personal warning*, that might give 'em opportunity to prevent so terrible a doom; For this makes

these

these spiritual *Canons* more formidable things than those warlike Engines, that at least give some notice by their *flash* before they do *execution*.

2. They are in our judgment as apparently guilty of *gross uncharitableness*.

For the Assertions for which we are *Excommunicated* by these *Canons*, relate to matters that are disputable among such as are truly *Orthodox* and *Pious*, nay among *Divines* of eminent *Learning* and *Judgment*. And consequently to *excommunicate* men for *declaring* their Opinion *one* way or *other* in these matters, is so far from being consistent with *Christian Charity*, that 'tis the worst sort of *Schism*, and plainly tends to confine that Reformed Christianity among us to a narrow *Sect* and *Party*, to which all sober Protestants may justly lay their *claim*, as their *common Interest*. Nay, we think this sort of rigor, in enforcing all contain'd in these three *Books* of human composure, (*viz.* The *Book of Articles* (inclusive of that of *Homilys*, *Art.* 35.) that *of Ordination*, and that *of Common-Prayer*) with so peremptory *Excommunication* of all that declare their *dissent* from any thing in 'em, more inexcusable in one respect, than the rigor of the *Councel* of *Trent* in their *Anathema's*, *viz.* that our *convocations* pretend to no such *Infallibility* in their decisions, as the *Romish Councils*; And therefore more of Christian *forbearance* and *charity* might reasonably have been expected from men conscious of the common infirmity of human nature, which cou'd no more secure *themselves* then *us*, fron mistakes in so *dubious* matters as these are.

As to all these Requests to our *Reverend Brethren*, we shall only add, that we hope they will either shew us our *Error* in judging these things to be *coruptions*, which we here beg the *Reformation* of, or else, that they will not account it *criminal* in us to *reform* 'em amongst our selves, nor urge us to *receive* 'em again after we have *cast 'em out*. For we may well be forgiven, that

we are as unwilling to go *backwards*, as ſome ſeem to be to go *forwards* in the deſirable work of *juſt* and *neceſſary Reformation.*

Laſtly, There is only one *Requeſt* more we wou'd offer to our *Reverend Brethren*, wherein we hope we may more confidently aſſure our ſelves of their complyance with us, *viz.* That we may all of us unite our endeavours with greater zeal and earneſtneſs for reviving that power of practical Chriſtianity and Holineſs that is ſo viſibly declining among us; particularly, by labouring to promote more of *Cloſet* and *Family*-Religion in thoſe under our care, and to preſerve or reclaim 'em from thoſe heinous ſins, (ſuch as *ſwearing, profanation of the Lord's-day, Intemperance, uncleanneſs, Pride, Luxury, &c.*) that have again overſpread this Land, and the *Proteſtant* Inhabitants of it, notwithſtanding all the calamitys they have ſo lately brought upon us. And we wou'd farther deſire, That as they have greater advantages of acceſs to our *Magiſtrates* than we have, they wou'd uſe all their intereſt and influence to engage 'em to a more vigorous proſecution of that neceſſary work, *the reformation of manners*, by a more ſtrict Execution of the Laws againſt open irreligion and wickedneſs. And we only crave leave to add theſe two reaſons that urge us to this requeſt; *The one is*, that our hearty *concurrence* in advancing theſe undoubted and important intereſts of our common Lord, wherein we profeſs to be *agreed*, will be the moſt ſucceſsful means to *cement* our affections; And when our Zeal is warmly laid out this way, we ſhall find leſs of *Inclination*, as well as *leiſure*, to proſecute our leſſer differences: *The other is*, that there ſeems to be an *extraordinary neceſſity* of our utmoſt efforts to ſave a periſhing People from that ruine that hangs over our heads. For as the heinous ſins that yet appear ſo barefac't and uncontroll'd among us, are greatly aggravated, both by the former terrible *judgments* under which we have ſo deeply ſmarted, and by the ſurprizing *Deliverance* that ſhou'd have oblig'd us to other returns to its bleſſed *Author*; ſo the many late *indica-*

tions

tions of divine anger in our *publick losses*, and in the *ill aspect* of our affairs, plainly tell us, that the Great God is yet pursuing a *Controversie* against us, because we have not answer'd his just expectations by returning to him. And as these renewed *monitary Judgments*, if they still prove ineffectual, presage a stroke of *destructive vengeance*, so we see nothing short of a *National Repentance and Reformation* likely to prevent it, and there appears no probability of that, till both *Magistrats* and *Ministers* in their several stations do *resolutely* engage in the design of promoting it, from a deep conviction of its absolute necessity to prevent our *Ruine*.

Post-

POSTSCRIPT

UPon the Review of these *Remarks*, I thought it necessary here to deliver my thoughts more distinctly and fully in reference to the following Passage then was proper for me to do, in the body of a Plain Discourse.

P. 15, 16. I have asserted, *That 'tis probable that the Psalms of David were compos'd in Metre*, and produc'd to that purpose the Testimony of *Josephus*, to which I might that of *Philo*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *St. Hierom* & *Isidore Hispalensis*, ‡

But I wou'd here add in explication of that passage, that I do not take *metre* or *verse* in the strict sense of the words, as if there were the same kind of *measures* and *verse* in the *Psalms* of *David*, that were afterwards in use among the Polite *Greeks* and *Latins*; For tho I know *Gomarus* in his *Lyra Davidica* has attempted to prove that the *Psalms* were compos'd in *metre* even in this strict sense, and his performance was at first greatly applauded by the Elder *Buxtorf*, *Heinsius*, *L. de Dieu*, *L'Empereur*, *Hottinger*, and others, yet *Lud. Capellus* has so far blasted the Credit of it in his *Animadversions* on it, that the Attempt seems given up as by other Learned Men, so by *Buxtorf* (the Son) himself. But for such *metre* or *measures* in the Hebrew *Psalms* as did accommodate 'em to *Vocal* and *Instrumental* Musick, and thereby gave 'em the denomination of *verse* as distinguish'd from meer *prose*, I see no reason to doubt of it; And this sort of *metre* the Bp. has groundlesly confounded with meer *prose*, in the passage the *Remarks* refer to (*Disc.* p. 8,) from which I shall now shew it ought to be carefully distinguish'd.

And to clear this I shall lay down the following Particulars.

1. *Poetry* in general was in its first rise vastly different from what it was afterwards.

‡ *Præf, ad chron.* Euseb. *St.* Hierom *præfat. in* Job Threnos *Isaiam & libror. Regum* Euseb. *prop. Evang.* l. 1. c. 11. *Orig.* l. c. 18.

'Tis so in all other *Arts* and *Inventions*, and no doubt was so in this. See what *Vossius* observes to this purpose, *de Art. Poet. naturâ p.* 76. when speaking of the *Versus*, ἀυτοσχεδιαστικὸς mention'd by *Aristotle*, he adds, *Interim erant hi versus rudes & impoliti Mox aliqua cura accessit, & tamen tum quoque solo constabant Rythmo ... hinc & aliqua metri ratio cæpit haberi sed rudiori plane & imperfecta, Tandem & metrica lex certa fuit & perpetua.* See also *ib. p.* 81, 82. To the same purpose, *Quintilian Instit. l.* 9. c. 4. *Peona nemo dubitaverit imperito quodam initio fusum, & aurium mensurâ, & similiter decurrentium spatiorum observatione esse generatum, mox in eo repertos pedes.*

2. The *Bible Poetry* differs vastly from that of the more polite *Greeks* and *Latins* (such as *Homer's Virgil's* &c.) and of the modern *Europeans* and *Asians*, nay from the modern *Jewish ones*.

And the difference lies chiefly, 1. As to feet of a long or short quantity artificially dispos'd.

2. As to a *Stated* and constantly equal *number of Syllables*.

As to both these Ingredients of strict *metre* and *verse*, the most learned *Rabbies* do indeed tell us they are not to be generally found in the *Bible Poetry*. See *to this purpose* Cosri, *part* 2 p. 133. 136, 137. *Dissert. Rabbinicæ*, at the end of *Cozri* p. 408. p. 424. See also *Pfeiffer's Dub. ver.* p. 545, 546, and 536.

And indeed tho many learned Authors greatly applaud the observation of Feet and of (*Rythmus* or) a stated number of *Syllables Artificially dispos'd*, as a thing of admirable use to excite or allay the Passions, and herein think the later Poetry has the advantage of the *Ancient*, (See *Is. Voss.* de *Poem. Cantu & Viribus Rythmi*, p. 11, 12, 13.) yet on the other hand, the observation of 'em does often *hamper* and *cramp* the Poet, that he cannot so freely vent himself. And tho this inconvenience may be tolerably avoided in more *Copious* Languages, it must have been great in so *narrow* a one as the *Hebrew* Tongue undoubtedly is.

3. As to *Rhimes* (I speake not here of what the Latins call *Rythmus*, but take the word in the modern sense for the ending of the Verse in syllables of the like sound).

Of

Of these there are but few in the *Bible Poetry*, and 'tis doubtfull whether designed or by chance. And the general use of these is certainly of a much later date then of the two former.

3. Yet there are in the *Bible Poetry*, besides the different *Stile* and *Manner of expression*, some *measures* observ'd in order to the accommodating the words to *Vocal* and *Instrumental* Musick, on the account of which composure they were *Verse*, as distinguish'd from *Prose*.

The most learned Writers on this Subject of *Poetry* give us the same Account of the Ancient Poetry of other Nations. See *Ger. Voss.* de *Art. Poet. nat.* & *constit.* p. 11. 81, 82. So *Is. Voss.* de *Poem. Cantu* &c. p. 1, 2. *Illud quidem certum omnem Poesin olim Cantatam fuisse — si itaque primitivam vocabuli acceptionem spectemus, Poesis vel Poema nil aliud fuerit, quam qualiscunque compositio cantui apta*, &c.

And the most learned *Rabbi's* give us the same Account of the *Bible Poetry*.

Thus *Abarbinel, Dissert. Rabbin.* at the end of *Cozri*, p. 409. *Authores carminum priscorum necesse habuerunt accommodare numerum literarum ad rationem melodiæ quam composuerunt ad canendum, & ordinem collocationis earum ad formam sonorum, & hoc ordine unicè respexerunt ad proprietates & requisita melodiæ.* Again *ib.* p. 410. speaking of the Song of *Deborah*, *David's Psalms*, &c. he saith *Omnes hi carminum Authores proposuerunt sibi tale aliqod genus, numerando literas ut æqualiter respondeant proportioni melodiæ ipsorum, & pro variatione melodiæ variant quoq; numeri literarum. Non est autem dubium quin habuerint melodias certas quæ longitudine temporis & captivitatum in oblivionem venerunt.* Again, *ib.* p. 411. Enquiring what sort of *Verse* the Song in *Exod.* 15. was he saith, *Certum est non fuisse ex primo genere* (i. e. those verses which had modern feet and rhime) *sed ex secundo* (i e. those that had only such measures as were requisite to accommodate 'em to singing as he had explain'd the distinction *p.* 408) *Constat enim ex octonis στιχοις quorum duo sunt valde brevia, & duo alia valde longa, quatuor mediocria.* And again, *ib.* p. 412. *Vides in isto Cantica quandoq; contrahi literas quandoq; extendi & protrahi, per additionem quarundam literarum ad justam faciendam mensuram & modulationem, prout aliquando etiam una & altera hujus rei causâ deficit*, of which he gives several Instances

ces, and then adds, *Non enim existimandum principem prophetarum errâsse circa accuratam literarum rationem, & ordinem scriptionis illarum, verùm carminis ratio & melodiæ necessitas sic postularunt.* See also the judgment of *R. Azarias* and R. *Sam. Arcuvolt*; ib. p. 428,429.

And therefore tho *Pfeiffer* in his accurate Enquiry into this matter denies the *Psalms* to be compos'd in *Metre*, taking *Metre* in the strict sense, yet he owns such *measures* or *Metre* as I here assert, and therefore tells us, *Dub. vex.* p. 537. *Poesis veterum Hebræorum in selectâ Vocum, & quodammodo proportionatâ ad Musicam accommodatione constitisse videtur.* And accordingly he compares *Davids Psalms* to the *Magnificat* in *Latin*, *quod metrice conceptum non facile dixeris, At ob talem styli conformationem non minus apte cantillari potest quam Psalmi Davidici*: (Of the same sort is the *Te Deum* ascribed to *St. Ambrose*, and yet Dr. *Comber*, *Orig. of Lit. p.* 179, tells us that *St. Ambrose* speakes of that *Hymn*, when he owns that he made *Hymns in verse* and taught 'em to the People, *Comment. in Luc. c.* 15. *Tom.* 3. *p.* 169.) And again, *Concedimus Cantica & Carmina ἐν πλάτει accepta, cantui ve accommodata. In quibus itaq; non est* metrica, *neq; tamen mere* soluta *oratio, sed Syllabarum atq; vocum certo numero, seu proportione quadam saltem rhetorica ad melodiam adstricta.* Where 'tis evident he takes *Metre* in the strict sense, but asserts such *Measures* as are distinct from meer *Prose*. And indeed some such *Measures* they must have had to conform their *Sentences* to *Musick*. In some of 'em (as particularly those *Psalms* I have quoted in the *Remarks*) those *Measures* are more obvious and are like the *Measures* observ'd in many of the *Hymns* us'd in the *Romish* Church, such as that.

Æterna Cœli Gloria,

Beata spes Mortalium

Summi Tonantis unice

Castæ que proles Virginis &c.

Or

Or that

Ave maris Stella.

Dei mater Alma

Atque ſemper virgo

Felix Cœli porta

Sumens illud Ave

Gabrielis Ore *&c.*

But others of 'em we are more at a loſs to underſtand, becauſe we have utterly loſt the Ancient Hebrew Muſick, even as to *Inſtruments* as well as *Tunes*: yea the Ancient *Muſick* of other Nations is loſt. See *Iſ. Voſ. de Poem. Cantu*, &c. *p.* 21. & 48.

Upon the whole then, ſince the Pſalms were wrote in ſuch ſort of *Metre* and *Verſe* as was then us'd; ſince the knowledge of their particular Muſical Tunes and Inſtruments is quite loſt, we cannot be oblig'd to an exact imitation of 'em; for that were to ſuppoſe us oblig'd to Impoſſibilities. The Commands therefore that enjoyn Chriſtian Churches to *ſing Pſalms*, neceſſarily oblige us to turn 'em into ſuch ſort of *Metre* and *Verſe*, as will accommodate e'm beſt to be *ſung* by the People. Whereas to put 'em into no other Metre than the *Pointed Pſalter* in the Common-Prayer-Book, is to exclude the generality of the People from any capacity of complying with God's own Command for *Singing* 'em. And as the *Tunes* of thoſe *pointed Pſalms* are quite different from the *Hebrew* ones, ſo they are as much a *human Invention* as the *Tunes* of the common *Metre-Verſions*. And therefore to ſet up that *pointed Pſalter* in the *Service-Book*, whoſe Tunes the body of the People cannot follow, to the Excluſion of thoſe Metre-verſions, according to which they can joyn in ſinging the *Pſalms* (as the Bp. ſeems to deſign) is in

his Language to set up a *human Invention* to the violation of a Divine Command, by rendring the Peoples observance of it impracticable.

And whereas the Bp. adds, *p.* 8. "That we cannot find that our "Saviour and his Apostles in their time, or those in the Age imme- "diately following, sung any thing in verse; but we are sure they "sung Hymns in Prose.

I shall only subjoyn, That I cannot imagine whence the Bp. shou'd be sure, *That Christ and his Apostles Sung Hymns in Prose.* For by the account already given, 'Tis no way probable since the Hebrew-Psalms (tho compos'd when Poetry was but in its first rise and as it were unfledg'd and unform'd) were in *Verse* as distinguish'd from *Prose.* Nay that in the Apostles time, and in the following Ages they *Sung* in *Metre* and *Verse*, seems more probable, from the Relation that *Eusebius* gives us from *Philo* concerning the *Therapeutæ* or *Worshippers* in *Egypt. Philo* flourish'd in the middle of the Apostolical Age, of whose *Commentary Eusebius* tells us, *Eccles. Hist. l.* 2. *c.* 16: "That it contain'd manifestly the Canons or "Rules hitherto conserved in the Church; and that insomuch as he "(*i. e. Philo*) has curiously described unto us the lives of our Ascetick or Religious Men, he plainly shews that he not only under- "stood, but also greatly admir'd and approv'd those Apostolical "Men, who probably descending from the Hebrews, did therefore "observe the ancient Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews. Now a- "mong other customs of those Therapeutæ, *Philo* relates *Eccl. Hist.* "*l.* 2 *c.* 17. That they made Songs and Hymns to God in grave "and sacred Rhymes (ῥυθμοῖς) of every kind of Metre and Verse. 'Tis true indeed that *Scaliger de Emend. Temp. l.* 6. falls foul on *Eusebius* for making these *Therapeutæ* or *Worshippers* to be *Christians*, and *Valesius, Annot. in Euseb: p:* 34. 35. falls in with him in that, tho he dissent from him that these *Therapeutæ* were *Essenes* and pretends to prove the contrary. But the Arguments of *Scaliger* and *Valesius* on both these heads, are well answer'd in *Bruno's Dissertatio de Therapeutis*, Printed at the end of *Colomes's* Edition of the Epistle of *Clement ad Corinthios.* But however that bee, 'Tis evident that

Euse-

Euſebius not only aſſerts ſuch Divine *Hymns* compos'd in *Metre* and *Verſe* to be in uſe among Chriſtians in his Age, but to have been a cuſtom deriv'd to 'em from the Apoſtolical Age, and continually preſerved in the Church, as *Philo* ſuppoſes ſuch Hymns to have been uſual among the *Jews*. So that we have better ground to conclude that Chriſt and his Apoſtles and the following Ages ſung Hymns in *Metre* and *Verſe*, then the Bp. has produc'd for their Singing *Hymns in Proſe*.

And for the *Alternate ſinging* of the *Pſalms* of *David*, Dr. *Comber* acknowledges the truth of what *Theodoret* aſſerts, *l.* 2. *c.* 24. That this cuſtom was firſt brought into the Church of *Antioch* by *Flavianus* and *Diodorus*. and from thence univerſally ſpread, *of Lit. p.* 87, 88. And Dr. *Hammond* ſaith, That St. *Baſil in the deſcription of a Clergy-man officiating. Ad Clerum Cæſar. Ep.* 63, ſaith, *they go to the Houſe of Prayer, and after the Confeſſion they prepare for the ſinging of Pſalms, ſpeaking of the* firſt Apoſtolical times, *For now*, ſaith he, *we ſing the* Pſalms *in* parts *or by turns, it ſeems they had not done ſo before, but altogether*, *View of the New* Direct. *Ed. fol. p.*138. In other *Hymns*, 'tis true we read of *Alternate ſinging* more early practis'd. And indeed ſince the Scripture only requires Singing *Pſalms*, Hymns, *&c.* in general, without preſcribing the particular *mode* of it, Chriſtian Charity ſhou'd make us cautious of cenſuring ſuch different modes of others as *ſinful human Inventions*, except when ſuch an inconvenient *mode* is choſen as excludes the main part of the Congregation from joyning in this Religious Duty.

FINIS.

FILE 806

THE END.